

Repair and Reuse Before Replacement: Rethinking Product Lifetimes in the Circular Economy

Dr. Nandini Rao *

Department of Environmental Studies and Sustainability, TERI School of Advanced Studies, New Delhi, India

Subject: Circular Economy | Language: English | Country: India | Published: 15 Oct 2026

ABSTRACT

The circular economy is frequently discussed in terms of recycling, resource efficiency and waste reduction, but an earlier intervention is often overlooked: extending the useful life of products already in circulation. Repair, maintenance, refurbishment and reuse can delay replacement demand, preserve embedded materials and reduce the frequency with which products become waste. This article examines the product-lifetime question through an analytical review rather than a conventional hypothesis-driven framework. It develops a "Lifetime Extension Ladder" that places maintenance, repair, refurbishment, component replacement and reuse before material recycling. The analysis identifies five recurring barriers to longer product lifetimes: repair cost, information asymmetry, spare-part availability, design constraints and consumer replacement habits. It then compares how these barriers operate across three illustrative product categories - small household appliances, smartphones and clothing - showing why a single circular-economy intervention cannot be applied uniformly. The article proposes a practical diagnostic tool for organisations and policymakers to determine whether a product should be maintained, repaired, refurbished, reused or recycled. No original survey results or fabricated empirical observations are presented. The contribution is an analytical synthesis intended to support future empirical research and practical circular-economy planning.

Keywords: circular economy; product lifetime; repair; reuse; refurbishment; maintenance; sustainable consumption; resource efficiency

1. Introduction

Modern consumption systems often treat replacement as the normal response to product deterioration. When a device becomes slow, a garment develops damage, or an appliance stops functioning, consumers may replace the item even when part of the original product remains usable. This behaviour creates a hidden sustainability question: how much environmental pressure could be avoided if products remained useful for longer?

The circular economy seeks to reduce resource extraction and waste by retaining products, components and materials at their highest practical value. Recycling is important, but recycling generally occurs after a product has already reached the end of its useful life. Repair and reuse intervene earlier. They attempt to preserve the value embedded in the whole product rather than recovering only its material components.

Despite this logic, longer product lifetimes are not achieved simply by telling consumers to repair. A repair may cost nearly as much as replacement; a spare part may be unavailable; repair information may be difficult to obtain; software support may end; or consumers may perceive an older product as undesirable even when it remains functional. Product longevity is therefore shaped by technical, economic and behavioural conditions simultaneously.

This article takes a different approach from a standard conceptual model. Instead of proposing a set of causal propositions, it develops an analytical review around a sequence of practical decisions: maintain, repair, replace a component, refurbish, reuse, and finally recycle. The purpose is to show where interventions can occur and why their feasibility differs across product categories.

2. Why Product Lifetime Matters

A product carries more than its visible material. Manufacturing involves raw-material extraction, processing, energy use, transportation, labour and infrastructure. When a functional product is replaced prematurely, these embedded inputs are associated with a new production cycle. Extending the life of an existing product can therefore change the timing and frequency of new-product demand.

Lifetime extension does not automatically produce an environmental benefit in every situation. A very inefficient product may sometimes be replaced by a substantially more efficient alternative, and repair can require materials, transport and energy. The relevant comparison is therefore between realistic alternatives rather than between repair and an imaginary zero-impact option.

3. Analytical Approach

The article uses a structured analytical review. Instead of collecting new participant data, it synthesises established circular-economy and product-lifetime literature and applies the resulting principles to three illustrative categories. The category comparisons are analytical examples, not original field studies. The purpose is to expose differences in barriers and decision logic.

The review is organised around four questions: What value is being preserved? What prevents preservation? Which intervention occurs earliest in the product's deterioration cycle? And what information or infrastructure is required to make that intervention practical?

4. The Lifetime Extension Ladder

The central analytical device is the Lifetime Extension Ladder. It ranks interventions by the stage at which they act on a product. The sequence is not a universal environmental ranking; it is a decision pathway showing how an organisation or consumer can consider retaining product utility before moving toward material recovery.

Stage	Intervention	Primary purpose	Typical requirement
1	Maintenance	Prevent avoidable deterioration	Care instructions, routine servicing
2	Repair	Restore a failed function	Diagnosis, skills, spare parts
3	Component replacement	Replace a limited failed element	Modular access and compatible parts
4	Refurbishment	Restore a used product for continued service	Inspection, testing, reconditioning
5	Reuse / resale	Transfer usable product to another user	Collection, trust, grading, marketplace
6	Material recycling	Recover material after useful life	Collection and suitable recycling infrastructure

5. Five Barriers to Longer Product Lifetimes

5.1 Repair economics

Consumers compare the expected cost, inconvenience and uncertainty of repair with the price and perceived benefits of replacement. A repair can appear unattractive when labour costs are high, diagnosis is uncertain or a replacement product is heavily discounted. Repair economics are therefore partly determined by the surrounding market, not only by the physical condition of the item.

5.2 Information asymmetry

Consumers may not know whether a product can be repaired, which component has failed, what the repair should cost, or whether a service provider is competent. Information asymmetry can make repair feel risky. Standardised repair information, transparent pricing and reliable service records can reduce some of this uncertainty.

5.3 Spare-part and tool access

A product may be technically repairable but practically unrepairable if appropriate parts, tools or diagnostic equipment are unavailable. Availability also includes time: a repair that requires weeks of waiting may be less attractive than immediate replacement.

5.4 Product design

Fasteners, component integration, battery accessibility, software dependencies and material choices can affect repairability. Design decisions made before a product reaches the market can therefore determine the range of lifetime-extension options available years later.

5.5 Replacement culture

Replacement is not always driven by failure. Consumers may replace functioning products because of aesthetics, fashion, perceived technological progress, promotional cycles or changing preferences. This means that product longevity is partly a cultural and behavioural issue rather than purely a technical one.

6. Comparative Category Analysis

The same lifetime-extension strategy does not work equally well across products. The following comparisons illustrate how the dominant barrier can shift by category.

Category	Likely lifetime-extension opportunity	Major friction	Useful intervention
Small appliance	Repair or component replacement	Low repair value relative to purchase price	Local repair networks; standard parts; transparent pricing
Smartphone	Repair, battery replacement, resale/refurbishment	Integrated components, software support, rapid model cycles	Longer software support; accessible parts; certified refurbishment
Clothing	Repair, alteration, resale, reuse	Low-cost replacement; fashion cycles; quality variation	Repair services; resale systems; durable design; care information

7. A Practical Product-Lifetime Diagnostic

The following diagnostic can be used before deciding that a product has reached the end of its useful life. It is designed as a practical checklist rather than a statistical scoring system.

- Function check: Does the product still perform its primary purpose?
- Failure check: Is the problem limited to one component or system?
- Repair check: Are the necessary skills, parts and tools available?
- Cost check: What is the realistic total repair cost, including time and transport?
- Support check: Is the product still supported by required software, standards or accessories?
- Reuse check: If the current owner no longer needs it, could another user reasonably use it?
- Refurbishment check: Could inspection and reconditioning restore reliable service?
- Recycling check: If continued use is not practical, is an appropriate material-recovery route available?

8. Business Implications

- Product manufacturers can design for serviceability and publish clear repair information. Longer support periods can also make repair more economically meaningful.

- Retailers can develop take-back, resale and refurbishment channels instead of treating returned or used products solely as waste.
- Repair businesses can reduce consumer uncertainty through transparent pricing, warranties on repair work and standardised service records.
- Digital marketplaces can make second-life products easier to evaluate by providing condition grades, repair history and functional testing information.
- Businesses should measure product-lifetime services as part of the product proposition rather than as an after-sales exception.

9. Policy Implications

Public policy can influence product lifetimes through several levers: consumer information, repair information requirements, access to spare parts, product durability standards, producer responsibilities and support for local repair infrastructure. Policy design should nevertheless account for product-category differences. A requirement that is practical for an appliance may be technically inappropriate for another category.

An important policy distinction is between formal repairability and actual repair access. A product can be theoretically repairable while remaining practically difficult to repair because of cost, distance, lack of parts or absence of skilled providers. Measuring actual access can therefore complement technical design requirements.

10. Economic and Social Considerations

Lifetime extension can create economic opportunities for repair technicians, refurbishment businesses, resale platforms and local service providers. It may also create affordability benefits when reliable used products remain available to consumers who do not want or cannot afford new products.

At the same time, a transition toward repair and reuse can disrupt business models based heavily on frequent replacement. This does not imply that replacement-oriented businesses cannot adapt; it suggests that revenue models may shift toward service contracts, maintenance, refurbishment, upgrades, parts and verified second-life sales.

11. Common Misconceptions

"Repair is always greener than replacement." Not necessarily. The comparison depends on product efficiency, repair inputs, expected remaining life and the environmental burden of a replacement product.

"If a product is repairable, consumers will repair it." Repair decisions also depend on cost, convenience, trust, information and replacement attractiveness.

"Recycling solves the waste problem." Recycling can recover materials, but it generally occurs after the product's functional value has already been lost.

"Reuse is only for low-value products." Reuse and refurbishment can create structured second-life markets for many categories, provided quality and trust can be established.

"Longer lifetime means slower innovation." Longer use does not necessarily prevent innovation; it changes when replacement occurs and may encourage upgradeable or service-based designs.

12. Research Opportunities

The analysis suggests several empirical research directions. First, researchers can compare stated willingness to repair with actual repair behaviour. Second, experiments can test how transparent repair pricing changes replacement decisions. Third, product-level studies can examine whether modular design increases real-world lifetime rather than only technical repairability. Fourth, longitudinal research can investigate whether resale and refurbishment markets change consumer attitudes toward ownership and replacement. Finally, comparative studies can examine how income, geography and access to repair services influence lifetime-extension decisions.

13. Discussion

The main analytical insight is that circularity is partly a timing problem. A product can pass through several possible value-preserving stages before it becomes waste. Intervening earlier can preserve more of the product's existing utility, but the feasibility of each intervention depends on technical, economic and behavioural conditions.

The article also highlights a distinction between product durability and product longevity. Durability concerns how well a product resists deterioration; longevity concerns how long the product remains in useful service. A durable product can still have a short market life if repair is impossible, software support ends or consumers quickly replace it. Product longevity therefore requires coordination between design, service infrastructure, information and consumer behaviour.

Finally, circular-economy strategies should avoid treating consumers as the only source of premature replacement. Manufacturers, retailers, service providers, platforms and policymakers all shape the conditions under which repair and reuse become feasible. Longer product lives are therefore a system-level outcome.

14. Limitations

This article is an analytical review and practical policy discussion rather than an original empirical study. The category comparisons are illustrative and should not be interpreted as measured market results. Environmental outcomes also depend on product-specific life-cycle conditions. Future work should test the proposed decision sequence with real product data, repair records, resale outcomes and life-cycle assessments.

15. Conclusion

Extending product life offers a different entry point into circular-economy thinking. Instead of beginning with waste, it begins with the question of whether an existing product still has useful life that can be preserved. Maintenance, repair, component replacement, refurbishment and reuse can each delay the transition from product to waste, although their feasibility depends on economics, design, information, infrastructure and consumer behaviour.

The Lifetime Extension Ladder developed in this article provides a practical way to examine these options in sequence. Its value lies not in declaring one intervention universally superior, but in encouraging decision makers to ask whether product utility can be retained before material recovery becomes necessary. Future research can build on this analytical approach by measuring real repair behaviour, comparing product categories and examining the economic and environmental conditions under which longer product lives create meaningful benefits.

16. References

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.

Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2019). *Completing the Picture: How the Circular Economy Tackles Climate Change*. Ellen MacArthur Foundation.

European Environment Agency. (2022). *Investigating the potential for circular economy approaches in the repair and reuse of products*. European Environment Agency.

European Parliament and Council. (2024). Directive (EU) 2024/1799 on common rules promoting the repair of goods. *Official Journal of the European Union*.

Forti, V., Baldé, C. P., Kuehr, R., & Bel, G. (2020). *The Global E-waste Monitor 2020*. United Nations University / UNITAR.

Moraga, G., Huysveld, S., Mathieux, F., Blengini, G. A., Alaerts, L., Van Acker, K., de Meester, S., & Dewulf, J. (2019). Circular economy indicators: What do they measure? *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 146, 452-461.

Stahel, W. R. (2016). The circular economy. *Nature*, 531, 435-438.

Zink, T., & Geyer, R. (2017). Circular economy rebound. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 21(3), 593-602.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Nandini Rao

Department of Environmental Studies and Sustainability, TERI School of Advanced Studies, New Delhi, India