The Circular Economy: Closing the Loop...or Stuck in One?

Author: Ritayush Suchismita Dey
Sunday, 12th July 2026

Spend a few minutes in any airport bookshop, corporate sustainability report, or government policy document and one phrase appears with reliable frequency: circular economy. The idea has long escaped ideation and entered mainstream discourse at remarkable speed. Governments from Brussels to Beijing have etched it in legislation. Consumer brands have embedded it in their marketing. The European Union has built its most ambitious resource policy, the Circular Economy Action Plan, around it. Repair cafes are multiplying in urban neighbourhoods. Deposit-return schemes are expanding across dozens of countries. Right-to-repair laws are arriving on the statute books. By almost any cultural measure, circularity is having its moment.

And the logic behind the idea is genuinely compelling. If we could close the loops in our industrial system, keeping materials in use rather than burying or burning them, we could reduce the extraction of new resources, shrink our waste streams, lower carbon emissions, and create more resilient supply chains in the process. The Ellen MacArthur Foundation, one of the movement's most influential advocates, estimates the circular economy could reduce global greenhouse gas emissions by 39%. That is not a peripheral contribution. If even a fraction of that potential were realised, it would represent one of the most significant environmental achievements in modern history.

The Myth: The circular economy will solve our global waste crisis completely.

The Reality: Physical laws, economic incentives, technological constraints, and ever-growing patterns of consumption mean that no economy can become perfectly circular. Circularity can slow the flow of resources through the economy, but it cannot eliminate waste altogether.

What the Circular Economy Actually Is

Before examining where circularity falls short, it is worth being precise about what it actually means. The circular economy is frequently reduced, in public discourse, to a synonym for recycling. That reduction misrepresents the idea significantly and, in doing so, understates both its ambition and its limitations.

The conventional economic model that has powered industrial society for two centuries follows a straightforward sequence: resources are extracted from the earth, transformed into products, used briefly, and then discarded as waste. Economists and ecologists call this the linear model: take, make, dispose. It is efficient at producing goods and delivering economic growth, but it is structurally incapable of managing the finite nature of the materials it consumes or the waste it generates.

The circular economy proposes to replace that linear flow with a set of closed loops. Its logic follows a hierarchy of strategies, each progressively more valuable than the one after it. At the top sits reduction: avoiding the creation of products and materials in the first place. Below that comes reuse, then repair, then refurbishment and remanufacturing, and only then, at the lower end of the hierarchy, recycling. The idea is that the further up the value chain a material is kept, the more of its embodied energy, labour, and design is preserved. A reused smartphone retains far more value than one whose components are shredded and recovered as raw material.

The Ellen MacArthur Foundation, whose butterfly diagram has become the movement's defining visual, distinguishes between two broad material loops. In the biological cycle, organic materials, food, timber, cotton, are returned to the natural world through composting, anaerobic digestion, and managed land use. In the technical cycle, manufactured materials, metals, plastics, glass, electronics, are kept in circulation through cascaded reuse, remanufacturing, and eventually recycling. The vision is of an economy in which the concept of waste effectively disappears, because every output from one process becomes an input for another.

That vision is powerful. But it is, as we will see, a vision with physical limits, economic constraints, and a fundamental vulnerability to the scale of human consumption.

Why it is So Powerful

The case for the circular economy is not rhetorical; it is grounded in measurable environmental and economic benefits that are already visible in the industries and countries where circular approaches have taken hold.

Consider steel. It is one of the most energy-intensive materials to produce from virgin ore, but it can be recycled without significant quality loss using electric arc furnaces, which consume dramatically less energy than the blast furnace process. Countries with mature scrap markets and high recycling rates have demonstrably lower carbon intensities in their steel sectors. Similarly, aluminium produced from recycled material requires roughly 95% less energy than aluminium smelted from bauxite ore. These are not marginal differences: they represent the difference between an energy-intensive industry and a comparatively low-carbon one.

In the built environment, companies designing products for reuse rather than disposal are demonstrating that circularity can be commercially viable. Interface, the American carpet tile manufacturer, shifted its business model to lease rather than sell its products, taking back worn tiles and reprocessing them into new ones. The result was a supply chain that dramatically reduced its dependence on virgin materials and created a predictable stream of recovered feedstock. Renault's remanufacturing plant at Choisy-le-Roi in France has for decades rebuilt automotive components using a fraction of the energy and materials required for new production, while selling them at lower prices than new equivalents. The economics of circularity, at its best, reduce input costs, create new revenue streams, and insulate businesses from the price volatility of virgin commodities.

At the systems level, the UNEP Global Waste Management Outlook 2024 estimates that a fully implemented circular economy model, coupling waste avoidance with comprehensive material recovery, could generate a net economic gain of USD 108.5 billion per year by 2050, compared to the USD 640 billion annual cost of business-as-usual waste management. The job creation potential is also significant: circular economy activities tend to be more labour-intensive than linear alternatives, because repair, remanufacturing, and sorting operations require human skill in ways that automated manufacturing or landfilling do not.

These are serious benefits. The question is not whether they are real. The question is whether they are sufficient.

The Physical Limits

The most fundamental challenge facing the circular economy is one that no policy, technology, or business model can fully overcome. It is written into the laws of physics.

The second law of thermodynamics states, in essence, that entropy, the degree of disorder in a system, always increases over time. Applied to materials, this means that every time a resource is used, processed, and recovered, it loses some of its quality, purity, or useful properties. Energy is dissipated. Contamination is introduced. Molecular structures degrade. No recycling process, however advanced, can return a material to its original state without consuming additional energy and generating additional waste in the process. Circularity is therefore not a loop but, more accurately, a spiral: each turn carries the material slightly downward in quality, until it eventually reaches a state from which no economically viable recovery is possible.

Plastics illustrate this physics with particular clarity. When thermoplastics are melted and reformed, the polymer chains that give them their structural properties shorten and weaken. Contamination from mixed waste streams, incompatible resins, pigments, and additives further reduces quality. A 2024 study published in Nature Communications found that the mechanical, optical, and thermal properties of recycled plastics consistently fall short of virgin resin, making them unsuitable for applications requiring consistent performance standards without the addition of virgin material. A 2021 paper in the Journal of the American Chemical Society proposed that plastic recycling should be understood not as circular but as "spiral," with each mechanical recycling cycle reducing the material's performance, until it is eventually downcycled into low-value applications or discarded. Only around 9% of all plastic ever produced has been recycled. The rest has been incinerated, landfilled, or leaked into the environment.

Paper suffers a related problem. Cellulose fibres shorten with each recycling cycle, reducing the strength and quality of recovered paper. Most paper can be recycled between five and seven times before the fibres become too short for further use. Glass and metals fare considerably better, as their molecular structures are more stable across recycling cycles, but even steel accumulates tramp elements such as copper and tin from mixed scrap, gradually degrading the quality of the recovered alloy. Composite materials, those combining two or more substances to achieve specific properties, such as carbon fibre reinforced polymers or multilayer food packaging, often resist separation entirely, making recovery of either component commercially or technically impractical with current technology.

The implication is important: "100% recyclable" does not mean "infinitely recyclable." The label describes a technical possibility at a single point in the material's lifecycle, not an unlimited capacity for recovery at full value. Every material that enters the circular economy is, to some extent, working against the tendency of the physical world toward disorder.

The Recycling Misconception

Even setting aside the physical limits of material recovery, the gap between what recycling achieves in practice and what the circular economy requires in principle is substantial.

Global recycling rates, across all materials, remain surprisingly low. According to the UNEP Global Waste Management Outlook 2024, only around 19% of municipal solid waste was recycled globally in 2020, while 38% was improperly disposed of through open dumping or uncontrolled burning. Electronic waste is a particularly stark example: 62 million tonnes were generated globally in 2022, but only 22.3% was formally collected and recycled. Since 2010, e-waste generation has grown five times faster than documented e-waste recycling, according to data compiled by the International Telecommunication Union. The gap between what is generated and what is recovered is not narrowing. It is widening.

For plastics, Europe represents something close to a best case: the EU achieved a packaging recycling rate of approximately 41 to 42% in recent years. Globally, the picture is significantly worse, with only around 9% of plastic historically recycled. In 2024, the world generated approximately 400 million tonnes of plastic waste. Plastic leakage into soils, rivers, and oceans reached an estimated 22 million tonnes in 2019 alone, a figure projected to double by 2060 without significant intervention.

Collection rates are the first bottleneck. In many countries, the infrastructure to gather, sort, and process recyclable materials does not exist at sufficient scale, particularly in low- and middle-income economies where waste generation is growing fastest. The World Bank estimates that in low-income countries, open dumping remains the dominant disposal method. The global waste management gap is, in practice, a gap between where new consumption is occurring and where functional waste management systems have been built.

Even where collection is good, contamination is a persistent problem. Recycled streams mixed with food residue, non-recyclable materials, or incompatible substances require expensive sorting and cleaning before they can be reprocessed, and the contaminated fractions are typically landfilled anyway. The economics of recycling also depend heavily on the price of virgin materials: when oil prices fall sharply and virgin plastic becomes cheaper, the economic case for collecting and processing recycled plastic weakens, and recycling rates tend to drop. For decades, wealthy countries exported much of their collected plastic waste to China and Southeast Asian nations for processing. When China's National Sword policy in 2018 closed its doors to low-quality recyclables, the global recycling system was forced to confront the fact that much of what had been counted as "recycled" had not, in fact, been meaningfully recovered.

Recycling works well, and should be defended, where material streams are clean, infrastructure is mature, and secondary markets are robust. Steel and aluminium recycling from industrial sources, glass bottle return schemes in countries like Germany and Norway, and paper collection in Scandinavia all demonstrate what high-quality circular systems look like in practice. But these examples are exceptional, not typical, and they operate within conditions that do not yet exist across most of the world.

The Scale Problem

Even if recycling rates improved dramatically and material losses were minimised, the circular economy would face its most fundamental challenge: scale. It is possible for a society to become measurably more circular while simultaneously generating more waste, consuming more virgin resources, and imposing a larger total burden on the environment. This is not a theoretical possibility. It is what is currently happening.

The evidence is unambiguous. The Circularity Gap Report, produced annually by Circle Economy Foundation in collaboration with Deloitte, found that the global circularity rate fell from 9.1% in 2018 to 7.2% in 2023, and further to 6.9% in 2025. This means that even as the circular economy has become a defining concept of global sustainability policy, the share of materials entering the global economy that comes from secondary, recycled sources has declined. In the five years between 2018 and 2023, humanity consumed approximately 500 billion tonnes of materials, an amount comparable to everything consumed during the entire twentieth century. The volume of discussion about circularity has nearly tripled over the same period. The volume of virgin material consumption has grown too.

Global resource extraction is projected by UNEP's Global Resources Outlook to rise by 60% from 2020 levels by 2060 without significant policy intervention. Municipal solid waste is projected by UNEP to grow from 2.1 billion tonnes in 2023 to 3.8 billion tonnes by 2050, an increase of roughly 80%, driven by population growth, rising incomes, and expanding urbanisation in regions where consumption levels are still well below the global average. The average person in an OECD country generated 552 kilograms of municipal waste in 2023, which is 39 kilograms more than in 2015, suggesting that even in the countries with the most developed circular economy policies, per capita waste generation is not falling.

The structural reason for this pattern is familiar from previous Eco-Mythbusters blogs. Efficiency improvements at the unit level, whether in energy use, material recovery, or product design, do not automatically translate into reductions in absolute resource consumption. When products become cheaper to produce or more efficient to run, demand tends to expand, absorbing the savings. When recycling improves, it can enable higher volumes of production by reducing input costs. The Jevons paradox, observed first in the context of coal efficiency in the nineteenth century, reasserts itself across material systems: efficiency without restraint on total volume tends to increase, not decrease, aggregate consumption.

This dynamic is compounded by the geography of consumption. The countries driving the fastest growth in material use and waste generation are not, in general, the countries with the most developed circular economy infrastructure. India, sub-Saharan Africa, Southeast Asia, and large parts of Latin America will account for a disproportionate share of new consumption and waste generation over the next thirty years. Building circular systems in those contexts, under significant cost pressure and with limited regulatory capacity, is a fundamentally different challenge from retrofitting already-wealthy economies with better recycling facilities.

Designing Out Waste

Construction and demolition waste represents one of the largest waste streams on Earth. In 2023, the volume reached approximately 2.5 billion metric tonnes globally, with projections pointing toward 3.8 billion metric tonnes by 2033. In the European Union alone, construction and demolition waste accounts for roughly 747 million tonnes annually, or approximately 1,685 kilograms per person. In the United Kingdom, it constitutes around 62% of all waste generated nationally.

Recycling rates within this stream look, on the surface, reasonably high. Many European countries report recycling rates for construction and demolition waste in the range of 70 to 90%. The reality behind those figures is more complicated. The majority of what is counted as recycled concrete is downcycled: crushed into low-grade aggregate for use in road bases, drainage layers, or fill material. The structural integrity required to reuse it as primary concrete aggregate is rarely achievable without significant energy-intensive reprocessing. Steel fares better, as it can be melted and recast without significant quality loss, but only if it is properly separated and not contaminated with coatings, fixings, or other materials during demolition.

Contamination is a persistent and underappreciated barrier. Mixed demolition waste, in which plaster, insulation, timber, fixings, and concrete arrive together at processing facilities, creates sorting challenges that drive up costs and reduce the quality of the recovered materials. The carbon cost of transportation from demolition sites to processing facilities and then onward to new uses adds a further layer of environmental impact that simple recycling statistics do not capture. There is also an economic dimension: recycled materials often compete with virgin alternatives on price only within specific regulatory or procurement frameworks. Outside those frameworks, the economic incentive to use recycled materials is frequently insufficient to overcome the logistical difficulty of obtaining and processing them.

The consequence is that construction recycling, while growing, operates far more as a linear process with a recycling stage appended at the end than as a genuinely circular system in which materials retain their value and quality through multiple cycles. High recycling volumes do not automatically translate into high environmental performance if the quality of what is recovered declines with each cycle and the total volume of waste continues to rise.

The Human and Economic Dimension

Even the most thoughtfully designed circular system has to contend with the behaviour of the people who use it. And human behaviour, shaped by economic incentives, cultural norms, and the fundamental pull of convenience, has not historically tended toward circularity.

Planned obsolescence is perhaps the most direct economic antagonist of the circular economy. When manufacturers design products to fail, become unfashionable, or lose software support on a two-to-three year cycle, they are effectively engineering waste into the system. The smartphone industry is the clearest contemporary example: average replacement cycles have shortened significantly over the past decade, driven by a combination of hardware fragility, software incompatibility, and marketing pressure to upgrade. E-waste generation has risen exponentially since 2010, growing five times faster than recycling infrastructure, according to ITU data. Each discarded device represents not only lost material value, but the embodied energy and resources used to manufacture it.

Fast fashion represents a parallel dynamic in textiles. The industry now produces roughly twice as many garments as it did two decades ago, and the average number of times a garment is worn before disposal has declined sharply. According to Circle Economy Foundation, only 0.3% of materials used by the textile industry come from recycled sources, despite the industry consuming approximately 3.25 billion tonnes of resources annually. The problem is structural: a business model built on selling as many units as possible, at the lowest possible price, is fundamentally misaligned with an economy built on keeping materials in use as long as possible.

Virgin material pricing is a persistent economic barrier that policy has so far failed to adequately address. In most markets, virgin materials benefit from subsidies, low extraction royalties, and the absence of pricing for the environmental damage caused by their extraction. Recycled materials must compete against this artificially low baseline. When oil prices fall, virgin plastic becomes cheap enough to undercut recycled alternatives on price, without any mechanism to account for the external costs of extracting and processing new petroleum. Extended Producer Responsibility schemes, which require manufacturers to finance the collection and recycling of their products at end of life, are one of the most effective policy tools available to correct this pricing distortion: Germany's and Japan's packaging recycling systems have demonstrated that EPR can significantly improve collection rates and material quality when well designed and rigorously enforced.

Deposit-return schemes for bottles and cans offer another example of how getting the incentive structure right can transform behaviour. Finland achieves collection rates above 90% for beverage containers through a deposit-return system that creates a direct financial incentive to return packaging. The United Kingdom, which introduced a deposit-return scheme only recently and initially with considerable political resistance, is still far from that benchmark. The contrast illustrates how the same physical infrastructure and the same materials can achieve radically different circularity outcomes depending on whether the economic incentives facing consumers are aligned with the desired behaviour.

Comparative Data Analysis: Circularity in Practice vs Scale

The following table draws on data from the Circle Economy Foundation Circularity Gap Reports, UNEP Global Waste Management Outlook 2024, OECD Environment at a Glance 2024, the ITU Global E-Waste Monitor 2024, and supporting peer-reviewed literature. It places circularity efforts alongside their scale counterparts across key material and waste streams.

Material	Circularity Effort	Scale Counter-Effect	Net Outcome
Municipal solid waste	Recycling and diversion from landfill improving in OECD	2.1 billion tonnes in 2023; rising to 3.8 billion by 2050	Absolute waste volumes growing relentlessly
Plastics	EU packaging recycling rate ~41-42%; chemical recycling emerging	400 million tonnes of plastic waste generated in 2024; plastic leakage to double by 2060	Polymer degradation limits recycling to few cycles; virgin demand rising
Electronic waste (e-waste)	E-waste recycling infrastructure expanding	62 million tonnes generated in 2022; collection rate only 22.3% globally	E-waste growing 5x faster than recycling since 2010
Textiles / Fashion	Secondhand markets growing; EPR schemes expanding	Only 0.3% of textile materials come from recycling; fast fashion volumes surging	Industry consumes 3.25 billion tonnes of resources annually
Food waste	Pay-as-you-throw schemes (South Korea: 95% reduction) showing promise	1.3 billion tonnes of food lost/wasted annually; roughly one-third of all food produced	Economic cost ~USD 1 trillion/year; upstream losses unchanged since 2016
EU material use (CMUR)	CMUR reached record 12.2% in 2024	2030 target is 23.2%; rate would need to grow >1.7 pp/year vs 0.1 pp/year achieved 2010-2024	EU not on track to meet circularity target; mostly linear economy persists
Global resource extraction	Resource productivity improving in some markets	Extraction projected to rise 60% from 2020 levels by 2060 without intervention	Virgin material demand growing faster than secondary supply
The global economy (all materials)	Discussions on circular economy nearly tripled 2018-2023	Global circularity rate fell from 9.1% (2018) to 6.9% (2025)	Circularity declining as extraction grows faster

Table 1: Comparison of circularity progress and scale effects across key material and waste streams. Sources: Circle Economy Foundation Circularity Gap Reports 2024 and 2025 (with Deloitte); UNEP Global Waste Management Outlook 2024; OECD Environment at a Glance 2024; ITU/UNEP Global E-Waste Monitor 2024; Circle Economy Foundation and H&M Foundation (textiles data); FAO Food Waste statistics; Eurostat Circular Material Use Rate 2024.

In each material stream, genuine circularity efforts are visible and measurable. Recycling infrastructure is growing. Policy frameworks are tightening. Material recovery rates are improving in several categories. Yet in each case, an expansion in the total volume of production, consumption, and waste is outpacing the gains. The EU's circular material use rate has grown by only 1.5% points over fourteen years, while the target requires it to nearly double in the next six. Global circularity has fallen. The circularity gap is widening, not closing.

The most striking single figure in this table may be the global circularity rate: 6.9%. That means that of all the materials consumed by the world economy in 2025, fewer than 7% came from secondary sources. More than 93% was newly extracted from the earth. This, at the peak of public and policy enthusiasm for the circular economy, after decades of investment in recycling infrastructure, and at a moment when the concept has never been more visible in public life.

Conclusion

The circular economy is not a failed idea. It is, in many respects, one of the most coherent frameworks for rethinking the relationship between economic activity and the material world that has emerged from sustainability thinking in the past half century. The genuine benefits of keeping materials in circulation, reducing virgin extraction, minimising waste generation, and designing products for multiple lives rather than a single use, are real, measurable, and worth pursuing with serious commitment.

But the central argument of this blog is that an idea can be genuinely good and still not be sufficient on its own. Just as AI efficiency does not automatically reduce environmental impacts when deployment scales faster than efficiency gains, and just as construction efficiency does not reduce material use when building volumes continue to expand, increasing circularity does not eliminate waste when the total volume of materials flowing through the global economy continues to grow faster than any circular system can process.

The global circularity rate is falling. Waste generation is rising. Material extraction is projected to increase by 60% before 2060. These are not the indicators of a world that has solved its waste problem. They are the indicators of a world that has adopted a powerful vocabulary for sustainability without yet grappling with its most difficult implication: that the volume of economic activity itself matters, and that efficiency and circularity applied to an expanding system may not be enough.

The circular economy is most powerful when it operates not as a standalone solution but as one element of a broader transformation: alongside reduced production of the most resource-intensive goods, extended product lifespans built into design rather than bolted on as afterthoughts, pricing systems that accurately reflect the environmental cost of virgin materials, and policy frameworks that hold producers responsible for the full lifecycle of what they make. None of these things is straightforward. None of them is achievable through technology alone. All of them require choices about what kind of economy is acceptable and what kind of waste is tolerable.

The most important insight may be this: the circular economy asks us to be smarter about what we do with resources after we have used them. The question the waste crisis ultimately demands we answer is whether we are willing to use fewer of them in the first place.

When the Circular Economy Works:

- When design decisions are made at the point of creation, not the point of disposal: products built for repair, remanufacture, and eventual disassembly, with material passports that make end-of-life recovery commercially viable rather than technically impossible.
- When economic incentives are aligned with circular outcomes through extended producer responsibility schemes that require manufacturers to finance collection and recovery, deposit-return systems that make returning materials financially rational for consumers, and pricing mechanisms that reflect the true environmental cost of virgin material extraction.
- When secondary materials compete on a level playing field with virgin alternatives, and when the value of keeping a product in use is captured by the business model of the company that made it, as in product-as-a-service and take-back schemes.
- When circularity operates upstream, reducing the amount of material entering the system in the first place, through design for longevity, modular upgrades, and systemic shifts away from single-use and short-lifespan product categories.

When It Doesn't:

- When circularity is treated as synonymous with recycling, and recycling is treated as a sufficient response to waste, without acknowledging that most recycling involves material quality losses, significant energy inputs, and geographic and economic conditions that make global scaling difficult.
- When circularity gains at the unit or product level are outpaced by growth in total production volumes, so that the absolute quantity of materials consumed and waste generated continues to rise even as per-unit efficiency improves.
- When virgin material pricing remains artificially low due to extraction subsidies and the absence of environmental cost internalisation, making it economically irrational for producers and consumers to choose circular alternatives even when they are technically available.
- When planned obsolescence and fast fashion business models systematically shorten product lifespans and accelerate replacement cycles, creating waste streams that no downstream circular system can adequately process at the volumes generated.
- When the physical reality of material degradation, the entropy embedded in every recycling cycle, is ignored in favour of claims that a product is "100% recyclable," without disclosing that recyclability is a statement about a single cycle under ideal conditions, not a guarantee of indefinite material recovery at full value.

Bibliography

1. Circle Economy Foundation and Deloitte. Circularity Gap Report 2025. Circle Economy Foundation, 2025. https://circularity-gap.world.
2. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and International Solid Waste Association (ISWA). Global Waste Management Outlook 2024: Beyond an Age of Waste. UNEP, February 2024. https://www.unep.org/resources/global-waste-management-outlook-2024.
3. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Global Resources Outlook 2024: Bend the Trend. UNEP International Resource Panel, 2024. https://www.unep.org/resources/Global-Resource-Outlook-2024.
4. Deloitte Global. Global Circularity Gap Report 2026: The Value Gap. Deloitte, April 2026. https://www.deloitte.com/global/en/issues/climate/global-circularity-gap.html.
5. World Resources Institute (WRI). 9 Key Findings on Global Progress Toward a Circular Economy. WRI Insights, 2024. https://www.wri.org/insights/circular-economy-global-progress.
6. Morales-Caselles, Carmen, et al. From Circularity to Spirality: An Integrated, Systems-Level Approach to Address the Plastics Problem. Journal of the American Chemical Society, 2025. https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/jacs.5c05454.
7. Liang, Yang, et al. Defining quality by quantifying degradation in the mechanical recycling of polyethylene. Nature Communications, October 2024. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-024-52856-8.
8. Payne, Jemma, and Paul D. Jones. The Chemical Recycling of Polyesters for a Circular Plastics Economy: Challenges and Emerging Opportunities. ChemSusChem, Wiley, 2021. https://chemistry-europe.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/cssc.202100400.
9. UNEP. Food Waste Index Report 2024. UNEP, 2024. https://www.unep.org/resources/publication/food-waste-index-report-2024.
10. Circle Economy Foundation and H&M Foundation. Textiles resource use data. Referenced in industry material statistics for the global textiles sector.
11. Eurostat. Circular Material Use Rate, EU, 2024. Statistics Explained, November 2025. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/w/ddn-20251119-1.