

UNTP-Conformity meeting #5

Transcript (edited for clarity)



Brett Hyland 1:03

So I think, I think I managed to start transcription, let's start. As usual, if you want to contribute to these meetings and participate, then any information that you impart, you are gifting to the UN. So with that understanding, let's press on.

Are there any new participants that we haven't seen at a meeting to date? Hi

Reinaldo, if you haven't been to one of these meetings, would you like to say who you are and who you represent?



Figueiredo, Reinaldo 2:00

Yes, quick. Good morning or good afternoon for you guys. I've been involved in standards & conformity assessment for many, many years and I was ISO CASCO chair from the year 2020 to the end of 2023. Good to be here.



Brett Hyland 2:36

Thank you especially given the lateness of the hour. Now one of the reasonably long outstanding issues that we're probably getting close to resolving now was the review of the GitLab webpage that deals with the sustainability vocabulary catalogue. We've had a few tries at that now. I think the intent now is clear in our own minds, that is it's a way of unequivocally referencing documentation that defines assessment criteria. Now of course these could be published by standards development organizations, they could be part of internal scheme requirements, or it could be a scheme that is referencing external documents from within their requirements, so there's a few, a few combinations. I think all we've really done is rewrite that page to paint that broader picture, rather than just focusing on scheme-generated documents as we did originally. Now what has emerged quite clearly as the missing component of all this is a template or a schema by which the UNTP participants can reference SDO-published documents - we don't have such a thing currently. So we will need to write such a thing. Now I'm not asking for us to approve the Gitlab page today. I guess I'm really asking, do you think we are finally getting close now to having a readable, sensible description of this whole vocabulary thing? So if anyone has had a chance to read it, you are invited to provide comment now. Gideon has provided a couple of comments to me separately, so thank you Gideon.

 **Gideon Richards** 5:02

Can I make one suggestion to it for reading purposes Is it worth putting the actual digital bit of it at the end of the document, not have it in the middle there because it sort of breaks the flow when you start looking at that. I know that this page is for digital people, but you know when you're reading a document, maybe would it be better to have that at the bottom and then you've got that flow of all the different bits.

 **Brett Hyland** 5:43, Gideon, you mean the coding section, do you?

 **Gideon Richards** 5:49 Yeah, sorry.

 **Brett Hyland** 5:50

Yeah, I agree. For most of us, the first line of code we see, we want to close the page and not want to read any further. So thank you for that excellent suggestion.

 **Brett Hyland** 6:15

Neil, I don't know if you've had a chance, but hopefully I did address your earlier concerns about how we describe standards.

 **Neil Savery** 6:23

Yeah, you have, Brett. So I haven't got any additional comments to make. Thanks, it's a better version definitely and agree with what Gideon's just suggested.

 **Brett Hyland** 6:31

OK. Well, it sounds like we're getting there. So, so that's good. And in fact that one topic has sort of consumed our energy really over these the first few meetings. So it'll be good to now put that to one side and move on to other matters. Speaking of which, we have a very interesting agenda item today, which is really the reason that I called this meeting at such short notice. It is, I suppose, quite fundamental to what we are setting out to achieve. So I just want to perhaps set the scene with a few background comments because this work has been going on for a long time, actually some years now.

UNCEFACT published a specification last year which was called Digital Product Conformity Certificate Exchange. It was called that because 'data exchange' was what it was all about - how to exchange certificates that contain verifiable links to related products and supply chain entity. And I will say I still think that work is perfect and I wouldn't particularly like to change word of it. But fast forward to 2025 and this work has now been picked up as part of UNTP, which has brought two quite wonderful things - it's brought the digital product passport system into the picture and it has also provided a protocol for end-to-end supply chain traceability which I thought I would never see in my lifetime. So total respect for that UNCEFACT vision, led by Steve Capell. But what I had not really grasped until this week is that the incorporation into UNTP has completely changed the context of our earlier original conformity work. That's because UNECE Recommendation 49 - UNTP is an implementation of that recommendation - is now explicitly saying that implementations will deliver trust in product claims and that this will lead to better societal outcomes. However, trust does not arise from the UNTP conformity credential model unless you specify the trust indicators that you require. And a second matter, that's related to trust, is whether what is being reported within the credential is even useful to society. And usefulness doesn't arise from the model either, without specifying what minimum assessment requirements apply. So, if I am very blunt, but I believe accurate, I would say that in the absence of evidence, there is no reason to believe that a scheme certificate brings any trust or serves any useful purpose. So why would we dream of calling that a UNTP conformity credential? How does that help society? How does that bring credibility to the UN? I think that, at the very least, we must rename some of our descriptors so that we are not misleading the public. That is where I think we are, I'll open the floor for discussion.

GR

Gideon Richards 10:27

Yeah, I have to say that's been part of my bone of contention all the way through this, how do you get that confidence and trust from what you're reading or what you're taking your linkage through. So I totally support that. I think it's also difficult to make sure that this is evidenced, but I think there are key pointers that you could pick out of this, like looking at the ethical side of things and things like that and accuracy of information. That would point and lead to something that will show the process has followed a decent route. I've also just put a comment in the in the chat

as well for people in terms of a Conformity Topic title but ecological resilience is listed as the title on the top level category one. Should it be environmental?

Z Zach (Pyx) 11:45

Brett, I think it's an important point you've kind of raised and kind of are articulating for us to consider, which is the trust aspect of conforming credentials because one of the things that. In our discussions at the UNTP level over the last couple of years, the idea of the conformity credential is to reinforce trust in the claims that organizations are made are making about their products or facilities. And one of the things that's also been acknowledged in our broader conversations is that trust is a social and almost personal construction. As in, a lot of people try to replace trust as a social or governance construct with a technical construction. You can trust this because this digital these bits and bytes are precise. What UNTP has tried to do is lean hard on existing governance, existing trust structures. That are already established, thus conformity attestations, thus casco style, third party attestations. UNTP wants to leverage to take advantage of that. But as we move into a digital ecosystem and into a digital determinancy, I think it is important that we understand how that shifts the social and governance and structural elements of trust. And so I think this is an important and timely conversation.

NS Neil Savery 13:48

Yeah, Brett, obviously this draws upon the email conversation that's taken place over the last couple of days and a number of people have contributed to that who are online right now. And I oversimplified one of my own comments deliberately, but it was really to prompt and seek some guidance from yourself as to whether or not it's appropriate to go down the path of being more deliberate in determining what represents minimum good practice. So having been involved obviously in the earlier project on the digital conformity certificate work, along with others who are online, we talked about and pointed to CASCO conformity assessment bodies, test bodies and their various roles and responsibilities, but we didn't direct. We didn't say this is what must occur. And so in the absence of that, as someone pointed out in that email conversation, there are many bodies today that are issuing forms of certificates or verifications, which we can't necessarily all trust. And if we can't trust because they're not necessarily following a rule book, so to speak, then society can't trust that either and that in my opinion, undermines everything that we're trying to achieve and that the UN Transparency Protocol is trying to achieve. So it your view, Brett, that

it is appropriate for us within the scope of this exercise to be more deliberative in saying that there are some minimum requirements that have to be followed in order for the conformity certificates, whatever the ultimate title of all of this is, has to achieve in order to build trust.



Brett Hyland 16:14

Well, I'll answer that in a sentence before we go to other speakers. So I believe we have to change the names of some things. We can't risk describing meaningless things as UNTP conformity credentials and I suspect most of them are going to be meaningless unless we make some pretty firm decisions. So examples that are authority-endorsed, then that could be called one thing. If on the other hand the trust is coming purely from within a scheme, then that's a different thing and I don't think that's a UNTP conformity credential. I don't know what it is, actually. I called it a scheme credential, but I think even then, the scheme should first buy into or sign onto some set of minimum requirements. Because you can't just say, you know, scheme X has just popped up and they're issuing scheme credentials under the UNTP. I don't think that's good enough.



Neil Savery 17:06

I agree with you on both of those things, Brett, which means that a scheme as we know them today can be subject to some form of accreditation or endorsement and that framework is part of the international system that we all understand and brings trust.



Phil Archer 17:46

I think everyone's agreeing, which is always a nice thing. I certainly do. You can't make me trust you. I don't trust you until I have a reason to. I mean, if you buy me a pint, I'm going to trust you more. But trust is a human emotion, as Zach said. I gave something to you and it's digitally signed, therefore you trust me, well that means nothing. What engenders trust, and you can only ever invite or engender trust, you can't demand it, is openness and transparency of the process that you went through before you issued the conformity credential. I need to know what your processes are, what your governance model are, and that you are accountable if I found something in your conformity credential which somehow doesn't match the reality. I'm in the middle of a very similar discussion here at GS1, where some parts of our organization say, well, it's come from me, so it's OK. Yeah, that doesn't matter. I don't

care. I want an organizational signature and I want public and our public documents that say the reason you are this part of GS1 is because you have a contract with us that does this and so on those contracts, those agreements, those procedures are what engenders trust.

Gideon Richards 19:07

Thanks for that. I was the lead technical editor on the ISOs IWA 48, which is the ESG implementation principles document and we started off with some principles. High level overarching principles and I'm just wondering if something like that could be a starting point, showing that the scheme has bought into it - we're pointing to things like integrity, outcome focus, equity, risk and opportunities, evidence base and maturity, these overarching principles. But we also had, as Phil's just said, things about accuracy, accountability, leadership and various other ones in there as well. So maybe there's a set of that we could say is the minimum that we would expect an organization to be demonstrating and how they demonstrate that would be for them to do, but it would lead people in a way of looking at things. Similar to the ethical standards for accountancy and things like that. So there are documents out there and I'm not suggesting we point solely to accounting, but there are documents out there that give this more credibility. I've had these kinds of arguments in a couple of committees in ISO as well, where we talk about, professional judgment, but how do I know your professional judgment is actually effective and appropriate? So I think there's, I think there are some existing things in that we can lift up and demonstrate the integrity, impartiality, conflict and how you handle conflicts of interest and things like that that might be the underlying set of criteria that you would have to demonstrate. I don't quite know how we would frame it, maybe it's not in the criteria, but it may be a top-level part of this from the UNTP.



Brett Hyland 21:55

Yeah, look, uh, before we go to Reinaldo, I just want to respond, by saying there might be two different subjects really. One is the governance and process by which the scheme operates. So that's one thing. And then there's a separate thing of, what are they actually assessing for a given conformity topic? Is it sensible, relevant, useful to society or is it just a waste of everyone's time and money? I think if a scheme is to have credibility, it should be clear that they have self-declared to a range of criteria and probably also uploaded evidence of their adherence to those things, so this can be publicly scrutinised - if they've self-declared adherence to some things when it wasn't true, then that could be exposed. So, we'll move to Reinaldo please.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 23:11

Yeah, thank you, Brett. I agree with what was said and I'm sure many of you already there was work to develop some criteria for organizations that conduct benchmarking of conformity assessment schemes. Because there are many of these organizations out there that they don't have governance, they don't have transparency, they don't have impartiality, they don't have the minimum process for how they conduct this benchmarking process. Some of those benchmarking organizations were using this to create barriers for those schemes that were not on list to participate in the benchmarking. I think this UNIDO document is unique, there is no other document out there that define these principles and I think this is going to bring some clarity in the market. It is about process, we're not talking about the content because the content is a different matter. But I think this document form UNIDO can be helpful for this group. It's not approved yet but it's in the last stage to be approved. And the other point is who is going to implement this document, I mean who's going to check that? It can be like Brett said, a self declaration, but at least we need to have the minimum for those organizations to self declare against. For example if you work to 17060, that's a good practice of conformity assessment, but there needs to have some judgment, whether first, second or third party. I'm not adjudicating for accreditation because we cannot accredit schemes because schemes does. It's not an object of conformity assessment. Thank you.

 **Brett Hyland** 26:49

Can I just check, Rinaldo, did you say that that UNIDO document was specific to ISO/IEC 17060 schemes or was it more general?

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 26:59

17060 was a reference to one of the CASCO document that define good practice of conformity assessment, but do you also need the documents for benchmarking of organization governance, process and terminology.

 **Brett Hyland** 27:22

Good. Well, I think we're all looking forward to seeing that document. That might be an interesting place to start.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 27:25

I can send it to you when we finish here.

 **Brett Hyland** 27:29

OK, much appreciated.

So I don't see any hands. It's really great to know from Reinaldo that there probably is in the near future a UNIDO document that we could leverage for governance and process type of issues. But what do people think about the idea that, for a given conformity topic, let's say water usage, or energy efficiency, that we should be asking some global authority to explain what sort of things are useful to assess, because I don't think we want to see schemes assessing useless things. But I'm not deep in that space, and I can see people on this call that are very deep in that space. So I would invite your thoughts please.

GR **Gideon Richards** 28:56

I was wondering, you know, if there are, if there are things out there like the ESRS, IFRS. Where from the ESG side of it and then sustainability documents that have the key fundamentals within them covering quite a lot of those things you've got already in there, like carbon footprint emissions. I think I would call it emissions reductions as opposed to carbon footprint. It's a slightly different thing and you could then, you know, point to scope 1-2 and three and things like that energy is more general than renewable energy, but it covers both of them. Within both ESRS and IFRS. So there are some in there and we know that that's being simplified.

 **Brett Hyland** 30:15

So I don't think I've made myself too clear because I'm not really debating about the list of Conformity Topics that UNTP covers. I mean we have a list of those. Whether that's perfect or not, I don't know. But I'm asking whether those topics are being assessed in a useful manner? I mean, a scheme might say we're going to assess water usage and we're going to assess the intent of this company to improve their water usage. I mean, that doesn't compare very well to a more quantitative assessment of the same topic. Should we have a view on that and should we be asking for a global authority to provide some insight to us as to what a scheme should be assessing?

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 31:06

I mean we have the scheme and then we have the standards that are linked to that scheme. What in my experience that is very important any type of conformity assessment activity is what is the process that was used to develop those standards. OK many scheme owners have their own process, but at least the process is open. They have process to receive comments when the standard is revised. I think that's the key for consumers because if I'm a small consumer, I don't know how standards are created but I want to know that somebody is watching that for me, on my behalf. It's not saying that all standards needs to go through ISO process and standards development organisation processes. The majority of the schemes today have their own process to develop standards. Some are good, transparent, get the inputs and some are not.

And that is the key for the credibility and trust, that's the output of all that chain of conformity assessment that I see that's very, very important.

 **Brett Hyland** 32:48

Thank you, Ronaldo, very much. We have not even mentioned that to date and I think that is a very valuable thread for us to explore together as part of what we would expect as a minimum for participating schemes.

NS **Neil Savery** 33:09

So if I take your comment, Brett, to be about who determines the value of what a scheme is offering, I would summarise that as two things. There's the consumer, which can be an informed or uninformed consumer who will determine the value. And to use an example, at the moment in a deregulated environment, EPDS are gaining significant global interest. They're not mandated in most parts of the world, but someone is placing a significant value on EPDs in the supply chain in order to be able to demonstrate the claims or verify the claims that are being made by product manufacturers and accumulate information in order to potentially report on ESG requirements. But the second element of where value is determined is through regulation. So you know I can envisage not too far down the track that there will be countries that start mandating EPDs, or something equivalent to an EPD, to be able to demonstrate to their satisfaction that the product, whatever it is, is achieving a certain target, whether it's Environmental Protection, whether it's reduced pollution,

reduced carbon emissions. And EPDs is the methodology, capable of being examined for the purposes of verifying whatever the claims being made. So I think it's. It's that combination of regulation and consumer values, particularly through informed consumers. If that was the purpose of your question, Brett.



Brett Hyland 35:11

Things that are coming out in discussion I think are totally relevant. So people must have been able to read my mind regardless of my poor expression. I guess we want to be careful that if we do want to move from trustless credentials to credentials that have trust, then I think we also want to be sure that they are serving a purpose as well. And I think the people have been answering that question here. Did we hear from Ulas or is it because your hand has disappeared again?



Nalbantoglu, Ulas 35:49

I just lowered my hand. Sorry for sorry for being late. I just missed a couple of minutes of the discussion, but I was wondering the purpose and the goal of UNTP. Of course I would like to have some bare minimum. I'm not against it that there are lots of schemes out there and I wonder which one of them could we say that we cannot trust or assessing the quality of the scheme and saying that no, it's not OK since you do not have the bare minimum. Maybe your scheme is respected in your industry, maybe it's very popular and the stakeholders of that industry use your scheme a lot, but we find that the scheme is not trustworthy. So should we go on that direction? I'm just trying to understand. I'm not judging.



Brett Hyland 37:03

So it's something that is possibly worth exploring, but my clear answer at the moment is 'no', we don't have the resources or the structure to go about reviewing individual schemes, so any credential that draws its trust from the within scheme itself must be self-declared at this stage. Yet we have to quite clear about what exactly has to be self-declared and possibly also the sort of evidence that should be provided publicly by that scheme, as evidence of the adherence. So I think that's probably a starting point, but I stress again that we are still in a situation where trust is being placed in the scheme itself and I think that has to be distinguished from an authority-endorsed process, which I think is a qualitatively different thing. We can't be calling all these different things by the same name.

GR **Gideon Richards** 37:59

I think you're right, but I think what we what we need is the minimum that they have to state, without actually saying what it is. Reinaldo, myself, others have said a number of words in there, you know, integrity, impartiality, conflicts of interest, all of those could be put into what they need to be able to demonstrate without actually saying what it is. And then it could be a yes or no. Have they demonstrated that with a link to a document or something that would actually show, you know, say modern day slavery, things like that, where people have statements on those kinds of things. I was thinking in a similar way to that, that there could be something on impartiality and maybe a number of other key elements where they would be required to point to their documentation or to something else that you know will demonstrate how they handle it. Then there's obviously the judgment is whether it's enough or not, which is slightly different, but it still fits with conformity assessment and assurance anyway because under 17029 and places like that, you know there are those kinds of requirements, even in 17065, there are those kinds of requirements that you have to be, you know, demonstrate whatever. So I think there's a way of doing it without actually having to go into the weeds. But I think there's a call there that we need to get people to think about what would give trust in the DPP

 **Brett Hyland** 40:12

Well, of course schemes may still be lying in their self-declarations. And there's other pathways that could be explored, like requiring some third party assurance over their declarations, but is that the same as an authority-endorsed process?

AW **Andrew Wheeler** 40:50

Thanks, Brett. Interesting discussion. I suppose the question I have is, is where do people get the trust today from this for the schemes? Where does that trust come from? And should we be looking in that area?

 **Brett Hyland** 41:07

Well, I suppose the answer is there isn't a great deal of trust going around, which is why this project exists. If we go to a global trade situation, we have, you know, the WTO technical barriers to trade framework, where countries are not supposed to be able to reject conformity assessment if it was undertaken as part of the CASCO

framework. So if a country is imposing duplicated conformity assessment in spite of there being CASCO certificates provided, then that's kind of frowned upon. But once you leave that quite formal space, it's up to individual buyers to say why they feel that something's trustworthy or not.

 **Phil Archer** 42:27

I think what we're discussing here, again, there's a huge amount of agreement across the board. I was looking at the actual data model that we have for a digital conformity credential. It's got the accreditation body in there and who's actually doing the assessment and what scheme or regulation. The attestations are there and the various conformity assessments. They're all in that existing data model. What I don't see explicitly, and maybe our conversation suggests we might add something in, is a link to some public documentation the process followed. I mean, in other words, I think a lot of what we're discussing and saying needs to happen is in there, but we could potentially encourage more by putting in a field that says put a pointer to your process document here, put a point. I don't think it's got a contact form, even. You know, if you find something that claims to be conforming but actually isn't, send me an e-mail here or whatever. So those things potentially we could add to the model if we felt it was important. There seemed to be a lot of agreement about the kind of things we need to do and importantly, what we must not do.

 **Brett Hyland** 43:40

Yeah but the issue is that the logical model, which was essentially the same model developed by the Digital Product Conformity Certificate Exchange Group, doesn't require anything. You know, most of those fields end up being optional and even if we said the accreditation field is mandatory, we would have to define accreditation. Do we actually mean accreditation of conformity assessment under the CASCO framework, which pretty much cuts out 90% of the of the work currently going on in the sustainability sector. Is it too much? Can we find that middle ground where the buyer can judge whether to trust a scheme's through other methods, like self-declarations? That scheme may be credible, it may not, since the credibility is coming from within the scheme itself, so its beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

 **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 44:48

I agree but I think we need to expand because as you said Brett, accredited work is

only covers a lower percentage, so we need to come up with some reasonable activities conducted externally that brings trust to these schemes, like benchmarking processes, peer evaluation processes. There is an Ecolabelling program that was created in the 1990s and they do peer evaluation, which is a credible process for hundreds of labels. I think we need to come and see what exists there and put that into those processes. Otherwise, many scheme owners do not know what they're doing, it's just marketing for them to have a path and say, oh, this exists, I'm going to go and get more credibility on my scheme.



Brett Hyland 46:22

Reinaldo, I think perhaps that's one very clear answer to my very poorly formed question earlier in this meeting. Now I actually missed who was the group that was doing that peer evaluation?



Figueiredo, Reinaldo 46:37

Yes, Ecolabelling. They exist for more than 30 years and they have ecolabeling programs. They check all of the processes we are talking about here. They do it through a peer evaluation process.



Brett Hyland 47:00

Wonderful. All right. So it looks like there really are things that we can possibly latch onto and it would be wonderful to think that we could ask a scheme to provide evidence of their participation in some set of credible activities. Perhaps these activities may even be specific to particular conformity topics in some cases.



Neil Savery 47:26

Yeah, I suspect I'm just trying to summarise in my mind what everyone's been saying. I get a strong sense that in a perfect world, we'd all like there to be accreditation, but as you say, that's not practical. And I think because we've all come from, or adjacent to, a sector for which accreditation is part and parcel of the process, we get some level of security and familiarity out of that. In the absence of that, then and having regard to Reinaldo's reference to peer evaluation, I'm kind of thinking, Brett, of what's going on with a group called National Building Products Coalition in Australia, defining the kind of good practice questions that should be asked by the participants. Brett, if you recall the document that's being worked on

there, which is aimed at both the people who potentially own the schemes or develop the schemes, as well as the consumer of the outputs of those schemes. And you're asking a series of questions of what you should be looking for as representing good practice.



Brett Hyland 49:09

Thank you Neil. David, let's make you the last comment, before we move to the outstanding issues.



David McNeil 49:16

Thank you and I think if we were pure about this then there'd only be about 10% who would tick the official box at this point in time, but and I wonder whether this goes to the implementation and embracing of UNTP, whether you set up your target is much wider in terms of being on board the journey with UNTP and conformity, but we give organisations a bit of a timeline. That here's the criteria that you need to aim for over a period. Neil raised the point about EPDS, that an EPD probably would fail in strict authority terms but the EPDS already have importance and credibility in in the construction market. So the question is what would we need to do to bring EPDS up to a standard? The pass rate might only be about 10% now but what would be the pathway to bring them up to 100%, if that makes sense? And is that a way of sort of bringing groups on board that quite wouldn't quite make the grade for what we think is the full criteria about trust? It gives them a pathway to it. You know, that's a suggestion.



Zach (Pyx) 50:54

Yeah David, I think that's a good suggestion. Brett, I know you need to move on to sort of the outstanding agenda items, but that sort of pathway of lower barriers to entry, with a ratcheting up of expectations is also how we encourage people to demonstrate or articulate their commitment to UNTP compliance. So on the implementers section, what we've said is there's a commitment to implement as a first stage and then as from the technical work group adds sort of gates that you need to demonstrate to actually articulate how I'm UNTP compliant. The folks who can demonstrate that they will stay on the list. The folks who do not demonstrate it or the organizations who do not demonstrate it will be dropped from the list because they're we're moving from an intent to implement to a demonstration.

Of implementation and we can potentially explore a similar pattern in the scheme ecosystem.



Brett Hyland 52:03

Fascinating, fascinating discussion and a very important one. We all want to be part of what is going to be a credible process. And I would also say that for our own survival, we need to be convinced that we can retain the respect of the formal conformity assessment world, as this is also the way much of the trade world works. If those parties, mainly governments, decide that we're not relevant to trade processes, then there's probably not a great future for our program. In terms of outstanding actions, Zach we were having a problem with the expert registration interface, is there any update there?



Zach (Pyx) 52:55

I'm sorry, I don't have an update. The last time we checked it was working, but intermittently.

Hang on, its working now, here is the correct link:

<https://uncefact.unece.org/display/uncefactpublic/UNCEFACT+Expert+Registration>



Brett Hyland 53:07

OK, now next action was for the Worked Example subgroup, which hasn't met again actually, so maybe we let that action sit for the time being. Next up was that we do want to articulate framework, or a schema, for SDO-published standards to be referenced within UNTP. That's quite an important action and it's and it's probably quite urgent too because implementers are going to want to essentially do that from day one. So the question is what group would handle that? Is it the conformity group? Because I suppose these standards are being referenced from our credentials, but equally they're being referenced from digital product passports too. Maybe a steering committee issue, Zach, to work out who's gonna create this schema by which we can all uniquely reference externally published standards?



Zach (Pyx) 54:36

Yeah, I think it could be a steering group thing. It also might be a technical working group element, Brett. And I also think it'd be worth us leaning on early adopters and early implementers to explore how they're doing it. Because they are using URIs and

URLs and kind of cobbling it together to try and meet the requirements. And so we can kind of explore what they're doing and then go, oh, that makes sense or oh, that doesn't necessarily make sense.



Brett Hyland 55:10

Yeah, plus we wouldn't like to let Phil Archer slip out of this, if we can possibly help it, but he has quite some experience in this as well.



Phil Archer 55:19

I'm going to share a link with you. One of my favorite things that exists, a thing called spec ref, where for that link you'll see that I just looked up standards around verifiable credentials on that and you get a whole bunch of links back to the various standards relevant to that. So that's all W3C, IETF standards and a bunch of others. Doesn't include ISO standards because of the way that they operate, but you can do quite a lot. And so there is a database there that you can use and that might be either something we might want to add to, contribute to or model ourselves on or whatever, but there's there is prior work in this area that may be I hope useful.



Brett Hyland 56:09

Cool, so it's probably quite urgent that we need to get that moving. So if we can somehow get that onto the next Steering committee agenda



Phil Archer 56:35

Count me in for that Brett.



Brett Hyland 56:45.

Ok now there was that old open issue #79, defining where observations finish and CA begins, which in actual fact triggered this whole discussion about trust. So I think maybe we just pop that back in the box for the moment. I just feel we probably need to think about what a scheme is, and what we think they should be demonstrating to be even participating in UNTP. And if there's a journey, well, I guess we need to define that journey, because we do need to move from trustlessness to trust. The last outstanding issue that I have was to confirm whether the scheme header structure allows reference to scheme endorsements. Should this allow self-declarations to be referenced? Quite separately, there are scheme endorsements

done through the International Accreditation forum, or national accreditation bodies, but they're not public credentials as such, so they are hidden from public view. So that's something I think is a parallel discussion in terms of where we or how we think we're going to progress towards trustworthy credentials.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 59:03

If I may, Brett, I mean the IAF endorsement process compared to other benchmarking organizations is minimal. There are many other benchmark organizations that exist in the environmental arena and that UNIDO document that I mentioned is going to bring order to this. But I also think I like the concept of a transition pathway for this and if the scheme is already benchmarked then it's one option that a scheme has for putting their name forward. If they are not, then they're going to look for that. You know what I mean? I think this is, is, is it's very important. It's the only way really, because accreditation still only touches a small percentage of all the schemes.

 **Brett Hyland** 1:00:06

So that opens up a third scenario where the scheme gets endorsed by a benchmarking organisation and, at least in that case, the trust is not just coming from within the scheme, its coming from an independent body. How we would differentiate which benchmarking organisations are credible from those that aren't is a very interesting question, but I think we have to keep exploring that because that one that may end up being one of the basic pillars, thank you Reinaldo.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 1:00:47

Yeah, it's my point of view.

 **Brett Hyland** 1:00:51

We've gone over time, amazing discussion. Plenty of plenty of good ideas have come out of that. The transcription will be available if you want to review what we talked about. And thank you so much for your time and especially for those in America that have joined us in the middle of the night. Thank you all and wish you a pleasant rest of the day.