DOI: https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2025-73-122

UDC 658:005.5

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORKS

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ СТРАТЕГІЧНИХ ПІДХОДІВ ДО ПЛАНУВАННЯ

Melnyk Andriy
PhD Student,
Lviv Polytechnic National University
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3832-0511

Мельник Андрій Володимирович
Національний університет «Львівська політехніка»

The paper presents a systematic comparative examination of strategic planning frameworks employed in contemporary organizational management. It integrates conventional and novel methodologies to improve comprehension of their practical significance, advantages, and constraints. The increasing intricacy of business settings drives the research, necessitating firms to implement more flexible, inventive, and sustainable tactics. The research uses qualitative analysis to investigate frameworks, including traditional models such as SWOT, PEST, and Porter's Five Forces, as well as modern tools like the Business Model Canvas, Value Proposition Canvas, Design Thinking, and a model for the Circular Economy. The findings indicate that whereas conventional frameworks provide robust analytical bases, they frequently fail to adapt to swift changes and sustainability demands. Contemporary frameworks offer strategic adaptability but may present difficulties in execution. This comparison aids practitioners and scholars in selecting effective planning tools tailored to contemporary business requirements.

Key words: strategic planning, frameworks, design thinking, sustainability, business strategy.

У статті ідентифіковано підходи до стратегічного планування, які відіграють ключову роль в успішному розвитку сучасних організацій та здійснено їх порівняльний аналіз. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена постійними трансформаціями зовнішнього середовища, технологічними зрушеннями та зростаючою потребою у стратегічних рішеннях, що є гнучкими, інноваційними та сталими, особливо зараз, в період світової турбулентності, реальних та «тарифних» воєн. Зокрема, дослідження акцентує увагу на зростанні складності бізнес-середовища, що спонукає підприємства до запровадження більш адаптивних, креативних та екологічно сталих стратегій. Аналізуються переваги та обмеження стратегічних фреймворків у контексті їх практичного застосування в сучасних організаціях, зважаючи на особливості бізнесу та його оточення. Метою статті є систематизація та порівняння стратегічних фреймворків які можуть поділятися на класичні та сучасні, відповідно до періоду їх створення, а також на аналітичні, орієнтовані на дизайн та комбіновані, за методологічним підходом, що використовуються у стратегічному управлінні, а також виявлення їх переваг, недоліків та сфери ефективного застосування. У дослідженні використано методи порівняльного аналізу, узагальнення та критичного огляду. До аналізу включено як традиційні підходи (SWOT-аналіз, PEST та PESTEL, Матриця Ансоффа, модель Портера «п'ять сил», модель McKinsey 7S), так і сучасні (Business Model Canvas, Value Proposition Canvas, Design Thinking, Blue Ocean Shift та інші). У результаті дослідження встановлено, що класичні моделі забезпечують базовий інструментарій для аналізу внутрішніх і зовнішніх чинників, однак є недостатньо ефективними в умовах високої динаміки середовища, потреби в цифровій адаптації та сталому розвитку. Водночас сучасні фреймворки пропонують інтеграцію дизайн мислення, екосистемного підходу та технологічної гнучкості, однак вимагають складнішого впровадження та організаційних змін. Практична цінність статті полягає у наданні структурованої основи для прийняття стратегічних рішень, зокрема у виборі відповідного фреймворку, що враховує специфіку галузі, цілі організації та зовнішні виклики.

Ключові слова: стратегічне планування, фреймворки, дизайн-мислення, сталий розвиток, бізнес-стратегія.

Problem statement. Companies grapple with formulating effective strategies that ensure sustained success and adaptation in the current dynamic and intricate business landscape. Despite the development of numerous strategic planning frameworks since the mid-20th century,

a consensus on the most effective frameworks for different contexts remains elusive. Furthermore, each framework presents unique benefits and drawbacks, leading to potential confusion or misapplication in practical scenarios. The lack of practical guidance and comparative insights highlights the need to thoroughly examine traditional and contemporary strategic planning methods to improve decision-making in strategy design and implementation.

Analysis of the latest research and publications. Recent research indicates a distinct transition in strategic planning from inflexible, conventional models to more adaptable, design-oriented, and sustainability-driven frameworks.

Jeanne Liedtka's design thinking methodology incorporates empathy and experimentation into strategy, enhancing its responsiveness to complexity. Gartner's ContinuousNEXT underscores agility and innovation in digital transformation, whereas the Hybrid Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM) framework incorporates data and global foresight into planning methodologies [6; 11; 19].

Contemporary strategic thinking is increasingly adaptable, human-centric, and forward-looking.

Identification of previously unresolved parts of the overall problem. Despite the development of numerous strategic planning frameworks throughout the years, various facets of the overarching issue remain inadequately addressed in current study and practice. A recurring problem is the absence of contextual guidance on the appropriateness of frameworks for various organizational environments, sectors, and strategic goals. The literature offers scant insight into the efficient integration or complementary application of multiple frameworks to enhance strategic planning. A further unresolved difficulty is the restricted adaptability of conventional models to situations marked by swift technical advancements, market fluctuations, and evolving stakeholder expectations. Although contemporary frameworks have started to include aspects of sustainability and circular economy concepts, this incorporation is still incomplete and insufficiently examined. Ultimately, numerous strategic tools provide insufficient methods for assessing non-financial performance metrics, including innovation capability, user experience, and long-term stakeholder value. These constraints underscore the necessity for more adaptable, cohesive, and contextually aware methodologies in strategic planning that correspond with the intricate requirements of the contemporary business environment.

The purpose of the article is to categorize and contrast established and emerging strategic planning frameworks, emphasizing their definitions, advantages, and drawbacks, to facilitate a more informed choice and implementation of strategic methodologies in modern organizational settings.

Summary of the main research material. In the dynamic and ever-evolving landscape of organizational management, strategic planning frameworks have emerged as pivotal tools for guiding businesses toward long-term success. Since the mid-1960s, corporate leaders have utilized strategic planning as the "one best way" to design, create, and realize their organizations' future [17]. As industries and economies have undergone accelerating changes, as well as the rapid development of strategic planning methods, the popularity of these frameworks has only continued to grow [7].

Firms that engage in strategic planning have been found to possess higher performance than those that do not [8]. This can be attributed to the fact that strategic planning is an ongoing and iterative process involving the development of cognition and serving as a learning process. Moreover, its emphasis on formulating strategies sets it apart and ahead of any other planning technique. However, during the early 1990s, the literature highlighted the potential weaknesses and failures of strategic planning, suggesting the need for a more comprehensive understanding of these frameworks.

This article categorizes strategic planning frameworks based on their methodological orientation, differentiating among analytical, design-oriented, and hybrid methods. By explicitly delineating each orientation and associating pertinent frameworks with these categories, we want to enhance comprehension of their practical ramifications and applicability in strategic management. This organized classification enables firms to efficiently choose tools corresponding to their strategic objectives, available resources, and innovation readiness, improving strategic decision-making processes [12].

Analytical frameworks typically emphasize systematic approaches for evaluating an organization's internal and external environments, competitive dynamics, and strategic positioning. They employ logical analysis and methodical evaluation to guide strategy formulation. Although these methods offer clear quantitative

or organized qualitative insights, they may lack adaptability in rapidly evolving circumstances.

In Table 1, we compare analytical approaches of strategic planning frameworks:

Analytical approaches encompass frameworks that provide organized, methodical techniques for examining organizational contexts and competitive interactions. Their primary advantages consist of offering explicit, organized frameworks for strategic analysis, enhancing decision-making via clearly articulated criteria, and assisting firms in comprehending their internal strengths and external risks with clarity. Nevertheless, these analytical tools sometimes reduce complicated realities to oversimplifications, exhibit excessive rigidity, and frequently inadequately respond to swiftly evolving environments and unforeseen market fluctuations. Moreover, they often depend significantly on high-quality data inputs and may neglect essential qualitative, human-centered elements vital for creativity and flexibility.

The Ansoff Matrix offers explicit growth guidance, is straightforward to comprehend and execute, and aids in identifying and evaluating hazards linked to diverse techniques. Nevertheless, it concentrates solely on growth strategies, oversimplifies intricate strategic

Table 1

Overview of analytical approaches of strategic planning frameworks

Name of Framework	Definition	Author	Year
Ansoff Matrix	A strategic tool used to devise strategies for growth through market penetration, market development, product development, and diversification.	Igor Ansoff	1957
SWOT Analysis	A framework to evaluate a company's competitive position by identifying its Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats.	Kenneth Andrews	1965
PEST Analysis	A framework used to analyze the Political, Economic, Social, and Technological factors affecting an organization's external environment.	Francis J. Aguilar	1967
Porter's Five Forces	A model that identifies and analyzes five competitive forces that shape every industry, determining an industry's strengths and weaknesses to assess its profitability and attractiveness.	Michael Porter	1979
PESTEL Analysis	An extended version of PEST analysis that includes Environmental and Legal factors, providing a more comprehensive view of the external macro-environment affecting an organization.	Multiple Authors (popularized by Gerry Johnson & Kevan Scholes)	1980s
McKinsey's 7S Framework	A model analyzing seven internal elements (Strategy, Structure, Systems, Shared Values, Skills, Style, Staff) of an organization to ensure they are aligned and mutually reinforcing for optimal effectiveness.	McKinsey & Company	1980
Core Competence Framework	Focuses on identifying and building a company's core competencies – unique strengths and abilities that provide competitive advantage and are difficult for competitors to imitate.	Gary Hamel & C.K. Prahalad	1990
Balanced Scorecard	A performance management tool that adds strategic non-financial performance measures to traditional financial metrics to provide a more balanced view of organizational performance across four perspectives: financial, customer, internal processes, learning and growth.	Robert Kaplan & David Norton	1991
Circular Transition Indicators (CTI)	A standardized methodology to measure circularity in companies based on resource input-output flows, supporting decision-making and performance tracking.	WBCSD (World Business Council for Sustainable Development)	2020

Source: compiled by the authors based on [1-3; 8; 9; 15; 16; 18; 20; 21]

situations, and neglects external influences or competitive dynamics [3].

SWOT Analysis is a straightforward and adaptable instrument that enhances comprehension of internal and external issues and is relevant across many sectors. Nonetheless, it may be excessively simplistic, fail to provide explicit counsel for action, and yield subjective effects [2].

PEST Analysis delineates external elements affecting the firm, facilitates strategic planning and decision-making, and aids in forecasting future challenges and possibilities. The disadvantages encompass the oversimplification of intricate ecosystems, the omission of internal organizational elements, and the necessity for continual updates [1].

Porter's Five Forces offers comprehensive industry research, enhances comprehension of competitive dynamics, and assists in determining strategic positions and possible profitability. Conversely, it inadequately addresses swift market fluctuations, may neglect internal competencies, and is less proficient in assessing nascent or swiftly transforming sectors [15].

PESTEL Analysis provides a comprehensive external assessment, facilitates strategic risk management, and is applicable across diverse industries and geographical regions. However, it can be labor-intensive to execute comprehensively, necessitates proficiency in various fields, and rapidly becomes obsolete without consistent revisions [8].

The McKinsey 7S Framework offers a comprehensive perspective on organizational efficacy, highlights areas of discord, and is especially beneficial during organizational transformation and strategy execution. Nonetheless, its proper implementation can be intricate, disregards external environmental variables, and necessitates extensive data and forthright organizational self-evaluation [18].

The Core Competence Framework promotes the utilization of distinctive organizational capabilities, facilitates long-term strategic planning and innovation, and assists in allocating resources to essential areas. Conversely, precisely identifying genuine core competencies can be challenging, may lead to neglecting other business domains, and carries the risk of excessive inward focus, potentially disregarding external opportunities or threats [16].

The Balanced Scorecard offers a holistic performance assessment, aligns daily activities with company strategy, enhances communication and attention, and enables longitudinal performance tracking. However, its implementation can be intricate and labor-intensive, requires consistent updates and organizational dedication, and poses difficulties in identifying suitable indicators, especially non-financial ones [9].

Circular Transition Indicators (CTI) facilitate precise benchmarking of circularity, conform to international reporting standards, and promote data-informed strategic decision-making. However, execution necessitates substantial data input, may be intricate for SMEs without technical assistance, and generally involves digital tools or consultant engagement [20; 21].

Design-oriented frameworks prioritize creativity, innovation, and iterative experimentation to address strategic challenges. These strategies inspire firms to engage in strategic planning via empathy, prototyping, and human-centered design thinking. While these frameworks promote innovation, their effective application may necessitate substantial changes in company culture and resources. In Table 2, we compare design-oriented approaches of strategic planning frameworks:

Design-oriented methodologies encompass frameworks that prioritize creativity, human-centered design, innovation, and iterative problem-solving. These techniques effectively foster innovative thinking, adaptability, client orientation, and collaborative engagement inside firms, rendering them particularly advantageous in volatile and uncertain market environments. Nonetheless, their disadvantages encompass considerable resource requirements, the imperative for organizational cultural transformations to accept experimentation (and its attendant failures), and possible challenges in assimilating these novel approaches inside conventionally structured business settings. Moreover, these frameworks may exhibit insufficient analytical depth in financial metrics or competitive dynamics, which could restrict their efficacy if applied without additional analytical instruments.

Design Ladder assists firms in evaluating and enhancing design maturity, illustrates the strategic significance of design in company expansion and innovation, and offers a definitive framework for incorporating design processes. Challenges encompass the complexity and resource demands of advancing through stages, requisite cultural and mentality transformations, and the potential restricted applicability across other industries or frameworks [4].

Table 2

Overview of design-oriented approaches of strategic planning frameworks

Name of Framework	Definition	Author	Year
Design Ladder	A model that describes four levels of design integration within organizations: no design, design as styling, design as process, and design as strategy, illustrating how increasing design maturity leads to better business performance and innovation.	Danish Design Center (DDC)	2001
Double Diamond	A design process model that outlines four phases: Discover, Define, Develop, and Deliver, emphasizing divergent and convergent thinking to solve complex problems through user-centered design and innovation.	Design Council (UK)	2004
Business Model Canvas	A strategic management template for developing or documenting business models, detailing nine key components: Customer Segments, Value Propositions, Channels, Customer Relationships, Revenue Streams, Key Resources, Key Activities, Key Partnerships, and Cost Structure.	Alexander Osterwalder & Yves Pigneur	2010
Value Proposition Canvas	A tool that focuses on aligning a product or service's value proposition with customer needs by detailing customer jobs, pains, and gains alongside product features, pain relievers, and gain creators.	Alexander Osterwalder & Yves Pigneur	2014
Blue Ocean Shift	An extension of the Blue Ocean Strategy focusing on systematic processes and tools to move organizations from highly competitive (red ocean) markets to untapped (blue ocean) markets through value innovation and creating new demand.	W. Chan Kim & Renée Mauborgne	2017
Design Thinking for Strategy	Incorporates design thinking principles into strategic planning by emphasizing empathy, ideation, prototyping, and experimentation to create innovative and user-centered strategies that address complex business challenges.	Jeanne Liedtka	2020

Source: compiled by the authors based on [4; 5; 10; 11; 13; 14]

The Double Diamond framework advocates for comprehensive investigation and refinement of concepts, fosters user-centric and innovative solutions, and facilitates collaborative and iterative development across diverse sectors. Nonetheless, it can be resource-intensive and time-consuming, necessitates robust facilitation and stakeholder involvement, and may pose challenges in structured or conventional settings [5].

The Business Model Canvas is a straightforward, visible, and intuitive instrument that enhances comprehension of business models, promotes thorough analysis and innovation, and is adaptable to diverse business sizes and types. Its drawbacks include oversimplification of intricate dynamics, inadequate focus on external elements such as competition, and a lack of depth about financial aspects [13].

The Value Proposition Canvas improves comprehension of client requirements, facilitates the creation of targeted and compelling value propositions, and promotes iterative testing and refinement, effectively complementing the Business Model Canvas. However, it may excessively concentrate on products, overlook wider company settings, insufficiently tackle market dynamics, and necessitate precise customer insights for efficacy [14].

Blue Ocean Shift offers pragmatic strategies for establishing new market domains, highlights the importance of concurrent differentiation and cost leadership, promotes innovative thinking,

and incorporates practical tools and case studies. Nonetheless, it entails risks and uncertainties in execution, necessitates substantial organizational transformation and resource allocation, and its success is predominantly contingent upon precise market intelligence and implementation [10].

Design Thinking for Strategy promotes inventive problem-solving, fosters customer-centricity, facilitates iterative learning and adaptation, and is widely relevant across all industries. The drawbacks encompass significant cost and time demands, the necessity for cultural acceptance of experimenting and probable failures, and challenges in integrating with conventional strategy processes [11].

Combined frameworks merge analytical precision with creative adaptability, uniting systematic analysis and innovation-oriented approaches. They enable firms to strategically address environmental challenges and market dynamics while promoting continual adaptation and agile decision-making. Nonetheless, their intricacy and requirement for interdisciplinary collaboration may obstruct execution. In Table 3, we compare the combined approaches of strategic planning frameworks:

Combined or hybrid frameworks amalgamate rigorous analytical insights with creative flexibility and innovation-driven strategic thinking. These methodologies are exceptionally beneficial, providing a more thorough and adaptable reaction to company intricacies, integrating structured analytical instruments with creativity-oriented procedures for strategy innovation and adaptation. Nonetheless, these integrated methodologies have considerable complexity and transdisciplinary demands that may pose implementation issues, particularly for businesses that lack resources or experience in handling cross-functional efforts. Moreover, the requirement for perpetual data integration, cultural adaptation, and continual monitoring frequently renders these hybrid methods more resource-intensive and demanding than solely analytical or creative approaches.

The Continuous NEXT Framework fosters organizational agility and resilience, ongoing innovation and enhancement, efficient technological integration, and proactive response to market disruptions. Nonetheless, its implementation and maintenance can be intricate, requiring significant cultural and structural transformations. Owing to technological reliance, it may present possible security and privacy vulnerabilities and may burden companies with limited resources [6].

The hybrid MCDM technique presents numerous features suitable for complex strategic decision-making. Initially, it enables a thorough assessment by integrating multiple criteria, such as scalability, risk exposure, financial sustainability, and market relevance, embodying real – world judgments' multifaceted nature. Secondly, incorporating various methodologies (e.g., entropy weighting, VIKOR, simulation) alleviates the limitations of relying on a single approach and enhances the reliability of the outcomes. Third, it supports decision-making amid uncertainty by employing quantitative precision in qualitative assessments, thereby improving transparency and consistency in strategic planning.

Notwithstanding its advantages, MCDM also has specific drawbacks. It necessitates a significant degree of methodological proficiency, perhaps restricting its accessibility to non-experts. The amalgamation of many methodologies might elevate computational complexity and

Table 3

Overview of combined approaches of strategic planning frameworks

Name of Framework	Definition	Author	Year
Continuous NEXT Framework	A strategic approach emphasizing perpetual innovation, integration, and agility by leveraging emerging technologies, adaptive governance, and continuous learning to thrive in rapidly changing business environments.	Gartner Inc.	2021
Hybrid Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM)	Is a combined decision-making approach that integrates methods like VIKOR and entropy weighting to evaluate complex options across multiple strategic criteria under uncertainty.	Yu-Min Wei	2025

Source: compiled by the authors based on [6; 19]

necessitate considerable time and resources for data acquisition and processing. Furthermore, the subjective weighing of criteria, even when substantiated by entropy or other objective methodologies, may still engender bias if stakeholder contributions are not sufficiently equilibrated [19].

Conclusions. This comparative review of strategic planning frameworks underscores the progress and diversity of strategic thought over recent decades. Traditional frameworks, such as the Ansoff Matrix, SWOT Analysis, Porter's Five Forces, and McKinsey's 7S, have consistently offered effective analytical instruments for assessing internal resources and external market conditions. Nevertheless, these conventional methodologies frequently demonstrate inadequacies in tackling the intricacies of swiftly changing markets, technological upheavals, and ecological issues.

In contrast, contemporary frameworks such as Business Model Canvas, Value Proposition Canvas, Design Thinking, and Blue Ocean Shift proficiently incorporate innovation, customer-centric methodologies, and sustainability into strategic management. These modern approaches provide considerable strategic flexibility and adaptability to change. However, they present issues concerning their complexity, the requirement for extensive organizational transformations, and the necessity for ongoing adjustment and oversight.

The analysis emphasizes that there is no generally ideal framework; the strategic planning process must be context-specific. Organizations must judiciously choose and integrate components from many frameworks, contingent upon their specific industry circumstances, strategic objectives, resource availability, and preparedness for innovation. Future research should focus on creating integrative or hybrid models that systematically integrate analytical precision, innovation-oriented creativity, and sustainability metrics to tackle increasing business challenges and global uncertainties more effectively.

This study enhances strategic management literature by systematically classifying frameworks into analytical, design-oriented, and hybrid methodologies. It offers scholars, practitioners, and decision-makers clear, practical insights into selecting and effectively implementing strategic tools suited to modern organizational challenges.

REFERENCES:

1. Aguilar, F. J. (1967). Scanning the business environment. Book. Macmillan. New York, 239.
2. Andrews, K. R. (1971). The concept of corporate strategy. Book. Dow Jones-Irwin, 245.
3. Ansoff, H. I. (1957). Strategies for diversification. *Harvard Business Review,* 113–124.
4. Danish Design Centre. (2015). The design ladder: Four steps of design use. In World Intellectual Property Organization (Ed.), Design for growth and prosperity, 10–11. Available at: https://dacatalogue.wipo.int/projectfiles/DA_4_10_02/Brochure/EN/wipo_wk_ldcs_ge_15_brochure_EN.pdf (accessed March 10, 2025).
5. Design Council (2025). The double diamond: a universally accepted depiction of the design process. Available at: https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-resources/the-double-diamond/ (accessed March 10, 2025).
6. Gartner Inc. (2019). Analysts identify five imperatives for ContinuousNext during Gartner IT Symposium/Xpo 2019, June 3-6 in Toronto. Available at: https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/gartner-says-continuousnext-is-the-formula-for-success-through-d (accessed March 10, 2025)
7. Harrison, J. S. (2003). Strategic analysis for the hospitality industry. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 44(2), 139-152.
8. Johnson, G. and Scholes, K. (1999). Exploring corporate strategy, 5th Edition, Prentice Hall, London, 972.
9. Kaplan, R. S., and Norton, D. P. (1991). The balanced scorecard – measures that drive performance. Harvard Business Review (Jan-Feb 1991), 71-79.
10. Kim, W. C., and Mauborgne, R. (2017). Blue Ocean shift: Beyond competing. Grand Central Publishing, 336.
11. Liedtka, J. (2025). The future of design if anything were possible in 2053: Extending designers' influence from product development to strategy-making. *The Design Journal*, 1-3.
12. Melnyk, A. (2024). Comparative analysis of modern strategic planning models and their integration with emerging technologies. *Economy and Society*, (61). https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2024-61-116
13. Osterwalder, A., and Pigneur, Y. (2010). Business model generation: A handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers. Wiley, 288.
14. Osterwalder, A., and Pigneur, Y. (2014). Value proposition design: How to create products and services customers want. Wiley, 320.

15. Porter, M. E. (1979). How competitive forces shape strategy. *Harvard Business Review* 57, no. 2 (March–April 1979), 137–145.

16. Prahalad, C. K., and Hamel, G. (2003). The core competence of the corporation. International Library of Critical Writings in Economics, 163, 210-222.

17. Riggs, D. E. (1997). Plan or be planned for: The growing significance of strategic planning. Association of College and Research Libraries, 58(5), 400-401. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.58.5.400

18. Waterman Jr, R. H., Peters, T. J., and Phillips, J. R. (1980). Structure is not organization. *Business horizons,* 23(3), 14-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(80)90027-0

19. Wei, Y. M. (2025). A Hybrid Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Framework for the Strategic Evaluation of Business Development Models. Preprints. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202504.0872.v1

20. World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD). (2020). Circular transition indicators v1.0: Metrics for business, by business. WBCSD. Available at: https://www.wbcsd.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/WBCSD_CTI-Report_English.pdf (accessed March 10, 2025).

21. World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD). (2021). CTI v2.0: Circular transition indicators – metrics for circular economy. WBCSD. Available at: https://www.wbcsd.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/CTI-2.0-Report-Metrics-for-business-by-business.pdf (accessed March 10, 2025).