Conclusions and Recommendations (draft)

1	• Update of SEEA CF was endorsed by UN Statistical Commission in March 2024.
2a	• Circular material use rate (CMUR) was presented with calculation method, data sources and possible way to increase it. There could be different valid choices for similar indicators.
2e	• Global classification of waste could be helpful and considered in SEEA CF update. • Production of new statistics might be needed to calculate circularity in addition to waste accounts.
2c	• Measuring circular economy (CE) is not limited to monitor waste flows. Socio-economic opportunities is an important topic to inform policy makers on the development of CE sector. • Using EGSS data to identify CE activities is an interesting approach. • The implementation of the new Classification of Environmental Purposes (CEP) is helpful, but it doesn't cover all components of CE. • Efforts to have an international harmonization of the scope of CE activities would be welcomed.
2d	• Based on country examples on measuring biomass flows and stocks, relevance of quality criteria for biomaterials, recoverability element, and boundary delineation of bioeconomy was pointed out. • There is a need to integrate bioeconomy strategies and measures with CE to ensure circular bioeconomy.

SEEA

Conclusions and Recommendations (draft)

2b	• Statistical guideline on plastic is going to be consulted and tested in 2024. • Plastic Toolkit based on the classification system Plastic-KEYs is available. Associating Plastic-KEYs with carbon emissions was suggested.
2f	• It is important to start measuring CE building on currently available data, while further development in classification is envisaged. • It was suggested to develop CE-specific guidelines instead of taking everything into SEEA CF update. • Regional approach would be necessary under circumstances, while international comparability is desired.
3a	• While efforts in measuring expenditures for climate change adaptation and mitigation expenditures are ongoing and the disaster-related statistics framework is available, gaps and challenges remain (e.g., measuring observed climate impacts, attributing actions to reduction in climate risks and impacts, indirect impacts of disaster). • Decision criteria, such as impacts, primary and secondary purpose, are being discussed.

SEEA

Conclusions and Recommendations (draft)

3b	• Integrated approach allowing a secondary purpose (double-tagging) and consideration of nature-based solution were suggested for the COFOG revision. • SEEA environmental protection and resource management expenditures can be a starting point for CC Expenditure Accounts. Criteria on CC expenditures should be further developed.
3c	• SEEA EA serves as the methodological basis for some of the Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) headline indicators (e.g. extent of natural ecosystems, provision of ecosystem services). Collaboration through CBD focal points would be important for implementation.
3d	• Importance of clear communication with indicators to policy makers, coordinated efforts in update of classification systems, development and discussions on estimates are highlighted. • Alignment between CEP and COFOG revision would be important. Double tagging with secondary purpose is an interesting idea, which could be tested with countries. • It is important to look at relevant statistics (climate and disaster related statistics) in a system as a whole in terms of scope and definitions etc. Interpretation and interlinkage with other domains are important. SEEA expenditure accounts could be helpful to move focus from response-based to prevention-based disaster risk management. It is important to connect communities and raise awareness.

SEEA