



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS
STATISTICS DIVISION
UNITED NATIONS



System of
Environmental
Economic
Accounting

Classification of Environmental Functions

Global Consultation

Comments Form

Deadline for responses: 31 December 2022

Send responses to: seea@un.org

Name:	Dr Olivier Thunus
Organization & country:	STATEC, Luxembourg
Contact (e.g., email address):	olivier.thunus@statec.etat.lu

The comment form has been designed to facilitate the analysis of comments. There are three guiding questions in the form, please respond to the questions in the indicated boxes below. To submit responses please save this document and send it as an attachment to the following e-mail address: seea@un.org.

All documents can be also found on the website at: <https://seea.un.org/content/global-consultation-classification-environmental-functions>

In case you have any questions or have issues with accessing the documents, please contact us at seea@un.org

Question 1: Do you have any comments on the proposed structure of the Classification of Environmental Functions structure?

The proposed structure of the CEF reflects well the experience gathered so far with CEPA and CReMA.

However, the accompanying text of the document '1_cef_introduction structure' could be further worked on, some ideas:

- The purpose of CEF as stated on page 2 needs to be further elaborated. If the intention of CEF is indeed to serve also *“the organisation of the information according to policy needs ...”*, than it needs to be acknowledged also in the introductory part the future potential evolution of the classification: e.g. inclusion of other activities/expenditure/transactions related to the environment(natural resource use and the minimization of the impact of natural hazards).
- Page 2, “CEF divisions 1 to 7 are also called (environmental) domains.” This is not anymore the case for CEF (as it was for CEPA): first, only 1 to 5 should be mentioned (as 6-7 are transversal); second, the divisions are sometimes groups of environmental domains rather than environmental domains (e.g. 4, 5)
- Page 3, second phrase, includes unnecessary confusing information (see strikethrough) for what the phrase wants to say. “This split also ensures a bridge with CEPA and CReMA ~~as separate classification and as used to classify environmental activities, products, expenditure and other transactions~~, so that time series reconciliation can be relatively easily established”
- Page 3, point 3, perhaps add also ‘expenditure and transactions’
- Point 3, the text is not very clear as regards classification principles, and specifically for the application of the main purpose criteria.

Question 2. Do you have any comments on the explanatory notes and on the heading reference?

A few comments for consideration, in view of clarity and simplification of the headings:

- The parenthesis in 1.1 “(excluding energy related measures)” is perhaps not needed in the title. This is part of the detailed explanations and is also quite clear that it is included in 1.3
- In 1.3, isn't ‘Energy management’ including savings? The title could be simply ‘Energy management’(as the classes in the structure already hint to what is there)
- In 2.2- same comment as above – title could be just ‘Management of natural water resources
- The names of classes 3.2.1 -3.2.4 do not follow the ‘material’ logic of the MFA and e.g. the class ‘Plastic’ is not suggestive; it is only when going to the explanatory notes that we see ‘Plastic’ class correspond to petrol-based product. The word ‘Plastic’ is too restrictive. A materials classification similar with MFA would be simpler, while examples such as ‘plastic’, ‘textiles’ could be used in the explanatory notes.
- The explanatory notes seem fine in general, but a further editing of the text is necessary

Question 3. Do you have any other comments on the Classification of Environmental Functions?

More a question than a comment: Has the impact of CEF, on COFOG 05, been analysed?