

ANNEX – Summary of general comments and comments on CEF structure

(Ref: “Overview of the comments from the global consultation on classification of environmental functions” – document for the meeting of the United Nations, 8 February 2023)

A. <u>General comments</u>	<u>Discussed/clarified by ESTAT in WG meetings and/or final docs</u>
1) “Functional” character of the classification	YES (March 21st and April 18th meetings. Further discussion in the subsequent meetings)
2) Clarification of classification units <i>(e.g. when applied to products, the classification unit is a product; and when applied to expenditures, the classification unit is a transaction)</i> and concepts <i>(e.g. measures, activities, cleaner products,...)</i>	YES (March 21st meeting. Further discussion in the subsequent meetings)
3) Re-arrangement of the structure and label of CEF to highlight specific policy areas	YES (March 21st and April 18th meetings. Further discussion in the subsequent meetings)
4) Alignment to international initiatives, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the measurement of the UNECE circular economy,• work on the SDG indicators,• initiatives to measure expenditures on climate mitigation and adaptation as well as on biodiversity	YES (March 21st and April 18th meetings. Further discussion in the subsequent meetings)

B. <u>Comments on CEF structure</u>	<u>Discussed/clarified by ESTAT in WG meetings and/or final docs</u>
CEF 1 Air, climate and energy	
5) Have climate change clearly identified in the CEF (e.g. in the title of the division).	YES
6) Have GHG reduction and air pollutants reduction as separated categories.	YES
7) Have climate change adaptation measures included (e.g. disaster prevention activities dedicated to extreme weather events such as storms, heat waves, droughts, flood, etc.).	YES
8) Have transport related activities grouped in a separate class at the third level split.	YES
9) Have activities enhancing carbon sequestration (carbon farming, reducing emissions from peatlands or other soils, etc.) identified	YES
10) Have renewable energies disaggregated at least to make possible regrouping/identifying carbon (Biomass - including biogas and biofuels - landfill gas, sewage treatment plant gas and biogas) and non-carbon renewable energies.	YES
CEF 2 Wastewater and water resources	
11) Move protection of surface and groundwater (currently in CEF 4.1) to CEF 2.	YES
CEF 3 Waste, materials recovery and savings	
12) Have circular economy clearly identified in the CEF: e.g. “waste, materials recovery and savings” replaced by “waste management and the circular economy”	YES
13) Change the name of CEF 3 division in "Material and waste management" In line with this, the classes could start in different order – materials should come before the waste as waste represents the least preferred option in circular economy (3.2 before 3.1).	YES
14) Have a more detailed split by type of materials at third level of CEF 3.2.	YES

CEF 4 Soil, surface and groundwater, biodiversity and forest	
15) Reference to ecosystems should be included.	YES
16) The links to the Global Ecosystem Typology could be developed	YES (*)
17) Have division “4. Protection and management of biodiversity and ecosystems” including “Activities, measures and products aimed at protection and management (including remediation) of biodiversity and ecosystems (which include abiotic soil and natural water resources).” Its rationale would be ecosystems include forest ecosystems but also other ecosystems in different realms.	YES (*)
18) Overlap in the application of the classes 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and 4.3	
19) Have “rehabilitation of species” (CEF 4.2 “protection of biodiversity and landscape”) as a separate activity, since it is not properly a biodiversity conservation action in its natural habitat.	YES (*)
20) Reforestation and afforestation are active and passive restoration activities, so CEF group 4.3 should be renamed as "Restoration and management of natural and induced forest ecosystems".	YES (*)
CEF 5 Noise and radiation	
21) Concerns to have noise and radiation grouped together at first level split.	YES
CEF 6 Research and development	
22) Add a third level split to have a one to one correspondence with current CEPA and CReMA classification breakdown	YES
All CEF divisions, groups	
23) The label of each CEF level split should be self-explanatory (e.g. Other activities related to...{specify})	YES
24) The classification should adhere to the rules used in current international classifications (coding system in the UNCEISC) for numbering and the use of the “.” as a separator.	YES

(*) Discussion within the WG meetings on a specific comment and conclusions reached have been applied to all “similar” cases without the need to discuss one by one, e.g. it has been clarified in the introduction that additional level splits can be added to organise the more detailed information available in each country or e.g. “labels” for divisions, groups and classes classification to ensure homogeneity has been submitted to written comments on CEP structure as follow up of revisions introduced compared to the first version shared for the global consultation .