Transcript

November 25, 2025, 8:06AM

Brett Hyland started transcription

Brett Hyland 0:04
For those that may not have a conformity background or maybe are new-ish to the group, I'll just orient this discussion with a short slide deck, then we'll open the floor for general discussion.

Zach (Pyx) 0:24
And Brett, is part of your orientation the disclosure around IP and that side of things or because we haven't covered yet, is that right?

Brett Hyland 0:30
Thank you, Zach. You are right, sometimes I show a slide showing all of the obligations and policies but I haven't added to my deck today, which is remiss of me. Anyway, I think the most important thing to say is that by contributing to these sessions, you are effectively gifting your IP to the UN. You know the UN works on an open development process and aims to make all resources available as open resources free of charge. So, if you don't want to contribute your IP freely to the UN, then please consider not contributing to these meetings.
So the first slide states the possibility for parties to undeservedly appropriate the UN's credibility, as we face the reality of parties describing themselves as UNTP compliant or UNTP registered or issuing UNTP credentials following the UNTP protocol. There's really no way we can stop them from doing and, maybe we don't even want to stop them, but if parties are making these claiming then we want them to be acting in a credible manner. So if these parties are issuing credentials for which linked data indicates no objective reason to judge that credential as trustworthy, I think we do have to consider how this reflects on the UNECE Recommendation 49 design principles, which is all about providing trustworthy product information.
And I think this group really is the one carrying the burden of working directly on these issues, at least more directly than other UNTP groups, simply because we are the conformity group. So it's a heavy burden that we carry and we must take it

seriously.
The next slide is to make crystal clear that we're not trying to stop schemes from using particular standards for the purpose of assessing products or facilities. Schemes can use whatever standards they want. We're talking about the credibility of the scheme itself and whether it provides a basis for confidence in the value of a conformity credential. And this obviously gets really important when the scheme themselves are directly responsible for issuing conformity credentials or they're approving other parties to do so. Those scenarios are quite common in the sustainability space, unlike, say, for product safety attributes.
So on the next slide, we're noting that there are widely varying approaches used for evaluating schemes, but not all evaluation approaches result in confidence.
The view of the working group that's been putting this together has documented that, irrespective of the approach used, we do need assurance that the evaluation process addresses a set of what you might call horizontals that apply regardless of approach. So scheme governance, development of the scheme, scheme standards, development, personnel competency and conformity assessment. These are all aspects that need to be part of a credible scheme evaluation.
The we need further assurance that each of those aspects is assessed against a credible international standard. We don't want lightweight scheme evaluations glossing over what may be shortcomings in the schemes. And part of this is that the party performing these evaluations, are either inherently credible themselves, or at least have something to lose if they are found to perform evaluations without integrity.
And so to end my little slide show, I'll just display a couple of quotations from UNECE Recommendation 49, which you can see emphasizes trust, talks about recognized authorities, it talks about trustworthy actors and it talks about credible sustainability credentials. So we do have a rough Idea of what we're aiming at in terms of credibility and, as the conformity group, I think it's beholden on us to help ensure that this is where we end up. So I'll stop sharing at that point.
And I'll now note that earlier today, my time, I circulated a revised version of a pair of tables that has been put together through the expert input of Reinaldo and Gideon, outlining a possible way forward for the treatment of credibility.
So in opening this subject up for discussion, I want to emphasise that this is ultimately about protecting UNTP.

We when we talk about transparency at scale and scalability obviously involves IT aspects, but I think metaphorically it involves more than IT because UNTP, if it's going to go anywhere, is going to have to scale into the global trade environment where well established processes already exist and UNTP will also need to scale to meet expectations of government for what they regard as trustworthy product credentials. And what we are tasked with, in my mind, is to define the minimum credibility that's consistent with the long-term survival of UNTP. And so it goes without saying, that protecting our favourite approach or deferring to some influential party really should not be a consideration. Our sole consideration should be the protection of UNTP, because those of us that volunteer our time see there is a real opportunity for a societal good and we don't want this squandered through poor choices. So with that introduction out of the way, I will open the floor for discussion.

NS **Neil Savery** 8:11
Can you put that slide up please, Brett? I've got it, but it'll be easier to look at it whilst we're all discussing.

 **Brett Hyland** 8:16
Yep.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 8:39
Yeah, Brett, Brett, if I may, can you go to that slide that you had covering comprehensive scheme evaluation?

 **Brett Hyland** 8:51
Yeah, I can do that.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 8:56
Please. But just to start here, I mean, let's go through this trend of thought that I'm having here and that we had when collaborating with Brett to develop the tables. OK, first, who can be the scheme owner? It can be government entities, or independent organization, or a certification body. This is the three possibilities of who can be the owner of a conformed assessment scheme. OK, so and then you have these organizations and they are going to decide, say, let's go and develop a scheme for

cell phones. So they need to see if there is a need for that scheme to be developed. There is a need to see if there are there are standards already out there that can support the scheme, and they also need to develop the scheme itself, the framework on how you conduct conformity assessment activities, like for my cell phone. What types of testing are going to be done in the cell phone? Am I going to visit the manufacturer of the cell phone for them be certified or not? What kind of conformity assessment is needed? Organizations that are going to the certification bodies are going to have requirements to evaluate their competence
So scheme owners need to have a framework on how they work, which standards they're going to select or if they're going to develop their own standards that's going to be listed in the scheme and the process they use to do that, if that process is independent or not. So one thing is how to develop the scheme, seeing the needs of the scheme, maybe develop the standards and the scheme owner needs to have competent people to manage this process or rely on a committee that they have established with competent people. Then another variable here is the conformity assessment bodies, how they are going to use the scheme, use the standards and to conduct the certification process. OK, So that's what I see as the minimum for us to have credible results on the chain of conformity assessment. I think that that those are the main variables, you can imagine there are many more dotpoints that sit underneath those 5 bullets there, but I think these are the main aspects that I see. I will stop here, Brett.

PA **Phil Archer** 13:53
Thank you, Brett. Thank you, Rinaldo. That's a very useful list and clearly articulates the kind of thing that are important. The thing I always come back to and I've broken record on this here at GS1. We have a program called Trusted Identity, all part of Vision 2030. Oh my goodness me, everyone's going to trust us. No, they aren't. Trust is a human emotion, and you can build whatever technological plumbing you like. And UNTP is the plumbing. But at the end of the day, it is a person that decides whether to trust or perhaps an organization that makes a policy decision to trust. And that's going to be based on an assessment of exactly the kind of things that Rinaldo was setting out just now. And the things in the table, those are important factors. It comes down to the transparency of the people who you are being invited to trust. So I made our legal counsel blanche the other day when I said, yeah, we're going to be issuing verifiable credentials, wee want people to trust us more, that

means that all our articles of association, the legal documents on which it founded need to be published. And she won't bite! If you want people to trust us, you've actually got to tell people who we are. We need to be much more transparent than we are. We're not particularly opaque, but we're, you know, you won't find the articles of association of GS1 on the web. I wish you would, so I'm pushing for that. So the UNTP is important, but it's just the plumbing. And yes, we want to protect it because we've worked on it and we've invested in it. One of the problems there is other people have invested in similar or other technologies that do the same thing. To take a simple example, I've recently become a co-chair of the W3C working group on verified credentials. So naturally I'm delighted that UNTP uses the W3C standards. You may know the name Christina Yasuda, who is one of the most brilliant women on the planet and she's the lead working on the SD-jwt standard that's just become an IETF standard just last week, neither of which interoperate with mdocs, the ISO standard. So we have, you know, challenges all around us, but in terms of the trust, I don't think that the schemes are what is going to bring credibility to UNTP. It's the people who use it and the transparency and whether I as a human being trust those things. So yeah, think, think when you say trusted credential, the question is always trusted by who?

Zach (Pyx) 16:52

Yeah, so two things. One, Phil, I agree with you. Trust is a personal and institutional construction more than it is a technical one. That being said, to Brett's point, having tools that encourage greater transparency and greater demonstration of how the data that's presented was arrived at in a structured or reliable or consistent manner enables people to take a firmer position, institutionally or personally, on the trust that's being asserted. And so part of what I think this proposal starts to move us towards is the ability to assess the different approaches out in the marketplace to providing third party, second party and 1st party validations of claims that are being being made. And so I think the point you're making is we need to be careful about how we characterize these tools and in terms of how they support coming to trust conclusions, but that I think it's also important that we sort of build out these tools so that organizations and people can make higher quality conclusions about the schemes and conformity assessments they should or should not trust because very like the same claim could be backed by two conformity credentials, one where there is a high quality standard, a high quality scheme, a high quality assessment process

and another company producing a product which a buyer might evaluate similarly but where the audit is a digital audit with no backing, but they could both be UNTP compliant. And how we help buyers distinguish between those two scenarios I think is what we're trying to uncover here.
The second thing I'd like to kind of understand is this paper Brett and team has flagged for internal discussion only. Part of genesis of this conversation was somebody who does audits of cell phone manufacturers and they're very keen on understanding this journey with us and actually some of them are on the mailing list for this group. So they are seeing this document. I'm wondering what the like we do follow an open development process. I do want to understand what the group is asking for in terms of our internal discussion and what we thinking we trying to achieve or how can I support the intent, while also recognizing that this already has reasonably wide distribution because of our open development process.
So just want to understand that.

Brett Hyland 19:58

Fair enough, Zach. Before, before we go to Gideon, maybe I'll just make a comment on that. So this this document crafted through the expertise of Reinaldo and Gideon and sort of shepherded along by me, has no claim to be anything more our own little brainchild. We think an important first step is to test it within this group. As you say, Zach, we've distributed to the mailing list, but we've not had a chance to talk about it. Now I realise not the entire mailing list is here on this call, but there's some very competent people on this call and so I think this discussion today a very important place to start. If we if have things wrong, it's far better to know right away. Then after we feel as a group that we've given it a sufficient airing, I think then we consider as a group what the next stage is and it may be engaging with implementers or other technical groups, but I'll stop talking. We'll go to Gideon and then Neil, please.

GR

Gideon Richards 21:05

Yeah, thanks for that, Brett. And I think one of the things that that I'm picking up and particularly Phil's comment sort of registered with me as well and that is it's, it's not just about credibility, but it's about the integrity and it's about the ethical stance of those doing the work as well. So you can have a great system scheme, but actually if you if you then just go along and have a cup of tea with someone and just say OK,

that's fine and walk off again then and it doesn't actually give any, there's no ethics there in terms of what you're doing and there's no integrity in the scheme that's there. So for me, one of the things I was thinking about is how do we underline it, if you like, with a requirement for the integrity and also the ethical stance to be brought into it, along with impartiality and so and the second table in the two-pager, it's how we've tried to embed this to actually show that it's not just about having standards and IAF MD25 and things like that, but you've actually got to think about it from a credible point of view from the organization and giving it integrity and also that ethical stance by those who are doing the work. We've been talking a lot about products, cell phones and things like that, but the product in in our world is also services and everything else as well. So I do a bit in ESG and my first thoughts are well how does this work from an ESG point of view as well. So that's why we put in some of the other things as well like the ISSA 5000 and those kinds of things.
I think for me it's a difficult one, I mean having the criteria is one part of it but having the underlying information and it being in a clear and transparent form, I think it's very important and so everyone understand what we're talking about on this. So that's I just wanted to throw that in. I think it's an important part of how you get that credibility in the process and if we haven't done that enough then you know maybe we need to do something else, but I think It's trying to embed that underlying theme into everything we do. Thanks.

Brett Hyland 24:12

You've covered some ground there, Gideon. So look, before I go to Neil, I will actually start sharing the second table, which is the set of standards that can be considered for use by these evaluating parties. Now to stress that hopefully the obvious again, these are not the standards that would be used to assess a product or to assess a facility, these are the standards that are used to evaluate a scheme. So that's the that's the page I'll put up now. And then Neil, if you don't mind taking the floor while I while I do that.

Neil Savery 24:46

Sure, Brett. So I did take the opportunity to provide some initial feedback to Brett on the first table, the one that we had up before. So I think it provides us with the basis to move forward with a framework. And I'm sure that it can be further enhanced, but as a starting point, I think it provides useful guidance. I'm reminded and I appreciate

anyone else's opinions on this, that we need to approach this on the basis that this is not a regulatory space, so it's voluntary and that those who are going to be participating as scheme owners and conformity bodies don't necessarily have to follow any direction by the UN or through the UNTP, because it doesn't have any authority to direct, so I'm approaching this from the perspective of how we can provide the best sort of logical framework that appeals to everyone to say that that's the way that we should all approach this this arrangement, such that if the UN was to approach the IAF to do something equivalent to say what the World Green Building Council does for having its international arrangements, which are also voluntary and aren't necessarily reflected through a scheme in the traditional sense of the scheme, but that people who participate in that framework and in that arrangement and want to make the claims that Brett had on his first slide that this is UNTP compliant or whatever those four different examples were, you could potentially have through an arrangement with the IAFA symbol that says these claims have a degree of accuracy or legitimacy because they've been assessed by an accreditation body or whatever who has assigned that symbol, whatever it is, to be able to make the claim, versus anyone else who sits outside of that framework, out of that arrangement, who tries to make those claims but doesn't have that symbol. I mean, obviously people can fabricate symbols, which goes back to the issue of trust and the ability to verify things, but it would mean that a party could be there could contest the legitimacy of those claims and it couldn't be back be backed up by the arrangements that are reflected in in this table here. So I'm thinking aloud there, but it's really processing what this is and how it could work in a voluntary, non regulatory environment.

Brett Hyland 28:17

Look, thanks Neil. You you've raised quite a few issues there as well. Now Gideon has his hand up, but I want to make a comment that ties something that Neil was talking about there with something that Gideon said earlier. So, so yes, the UNTP is a voluntary system, but schemes can opt to participate in this process and register their vocabulary. And I think it's quite convenient that we focus our attention on schemes because we have some hold or leverage over them. I mean, if they're found to be not acting with integrity we can we can de-participate them, for want of a better word. They do have something to lose, so their scheme vocabulary registered with the UN would disappear, for example and that that might be that might be a motivation to do the right thing. And Gideon was coming from a similar angle when

talking about ethics. And you know, it's all very well to say that we expect everyone to have very good ethics but if there's no penalty for not having good ethics, then that's the other side of the coin. Anyway, you've got your hand up, Gideon.

Gideon Richards 29:55
Yeah, I was just going to pick up on what Neil said because if you remember, with Brett and Ronaldo, we've spent quite a lot of time and me particularly saying, yeah, I want us to be really careful how we actually structure the wording on this and hence we've got examples of the different documents because what I was trying to get out was we need to ensure we are not creating barriers to trade for exactly what Neil saying if there's an organisation that has credibility, then we don't want to be necessarily saying you can't join this because you don't work under a particular standard or a particular organisation's route. And I think that that was one of the important things for me when we were developing this is we're trying to establish something that anyone can enter into it, but we're trying to also show what the level of credibility would look like from our point of view. And that's another part of this second table, I suppose, to actually try and give that emphasis into here of what that might look like without actually creating any barriers to trade. I don't know how well it's been done. You know, there's lots of things you can always pick up and say, oh, what about? But I think that's the essence of what I was trying to get out as well. We don't want to be too dictatorial, but we do want that credibility and hence the integrity and the ethical part of it that goes with, you know, having credible documents and a credible scheme and governance system in place. Thank you.

Brett Hyland 32:03
No. Well, yes. Well, I'll just gotta note that Anil has has joined us. Anil, have you joined one of these meetings before?

Anil Jauhri 32:13
Yes, I have. Yes, I have joined. I have joined earlier, yes.

Brett Hyland 32:15
Oh.
OK. Thank you. Righto, Zach, over to you.

Zach (Pyx) 32:20

I actually wanted to ask about the progressive nature of the structure that you guys have developed on the first page, particular specifically the idea of self-declaration and then suitability established by an IAF MLA regulate signatory body and then peer assessment. I was wondering if you intending that these be sort of progressively stronger like 2 is better than one and three is better than four or sorry, yeah, that they're they get better as you move to the right. And I'm wondering about peer assessed self-declared schemes like that are not necessarily recognized by an MLA signatory body and I'm just like and I'm not an expert, I'm just what I'm just testing the theory of the escalation. First, is it an escalation? and then testing the theory of it making sure that it holds any scenarios that we might want to support.

Brett Hyland 33:20

I would say that it's not a strict progression, but it's certainly intended to be a general trend towards higher credibility. And I would certainly say that item 5, the scheme benchmarking, if done according to the criteria that we set out, is of far greater credibility than a self-declaration, even if done to the same stand standards. So yes, that that's the intention Zac. Now there's all sorts of I suppose combinations that one could envisage, I mean it could be a government owned scheme that is also peer assessed or benchmarked. You know you wonder where you might stop with this, but what was your specific query example? Did you say it was a self-declared scheme that had been peer assessed?

Zach (Pyx) 34:05

I was just wondering if. So basically what I was wondering is, are they progressive? Do they build on top of each other? And if they build on top of each other, the answer is no. OK.

Brett Hyland 34:15

Well, no, they don't build on each other, they're quite different beasts, each of them. But I suppose a scheme could voluntarily submit to two different pathways at the same time if they had deep pockets and loved being audited. I think Reinaldo might want to answer this question.

Figueiredo, Reinaldo 34:34

Yeah, yeah. No, it's you're right, Brett. Each box can stay in each box. This can be model. You can use more than one to build credibility in the process because we cannot put all the buckets in one. I'm I start to participate in IFE 93. I mean, if you put all the buckets there, schemes are not going to be able to do this, they don't have the infrastructure to do it. And the other point that we need to see here, we want to see people to read this and validate this, because this is the first back and forth that we had. We want people to question this, to validate if this is well taken, this can be implemented, you know what I mean? But I think it's not easy to put everything that exists today in in this type of format and we need to we need to be very open but keeping what's the purpose and the objective of the UN on this, I think that is it. Thank you, Brett.

Brett Hyland 36:12

Good on you, Ronaldo. We've got Anil and then Phil.

Anil Jauhri 36:17

Yeah, actually I was looking at this self declaration bit, number one column, and when self declaration is there, that means there's no third party intervention. So I am not sure whether evaluation by an AB is required because that scheme doesn't require Accreditation body to get involved. So with self declaration scheme. I'm not sure whether the second column is.

Figueiredo, Reinaldo 36:32

It's OK. Anil, self declaration here is for the scheme owner to self declare that they have those requirements that we said, that they have governance, that how they develop standards, anything in those five scheme aspects can be by self declaration.

Anil Jauhri 36:59

OK, so this is for scheme only

OK.

Figueiredo, Reinaldo 37:13

The one point, sorry I have my lag in my mind here, one point is the structure of the

scheme owner and how to see if that structure is valid or not. OK, the other one is how the scheme is going to be implemented.

Brett Hyland 37:39
So is that OK, Anil? We're not, we're not talking at all about self declaration to a set of scheme standards. That's not the intention here. We're talking about the credibility of the scheme.

AJ **Anil Jauhri** 37:50
Yeah, I understand. Understood. Yeah, sorry. Now it is a self declaration by the scheme now. Yeah.

Brett Hyland 37:56
Very good to clarify that, Phil.

PA **Phil Archer** 37:59
But very briefly. I'm conscious that I'm in the company of people whose whole career is based on this job of conformity assessment and that's not my world at all. One of just looking at this because I don't know the ISO IEC standards that are referred to here. Is there a process of or an expectation that once an assessment of an assessment body has been done, it is redone periodically? Because if it's done once and then you forget about it, well then that doesn't mean a lot. In our world we want to give a date for the last time we checked something. And what's going through my mind here particularly is in my at the very beginning of my career, I was involved in what online we simply call trust marks, and everyone was trying to establish themselves with a new trust mark for this new thing called the web. And it turned out that actually it was far more valuable to the trust mark that they appeared on a high profile website like a Yahoo or an Alta Vista, for those of you who are very old, than the presence of that trust mark on some other website. In other words, it actually worked the other way around. So I'm assuming that within all these ISO IEC standards, that issue was addressed.

Brett Hyland 39:14
Well, not necessarily in those standards that we'd listed as examples. But if you look at the page that we're looking at now, if you're submitting yourself to, let's say, box

2, the suitability established by an IAF MLA signatory body, yeah, that's not once and done, you need to resubmit periodically. Same will be true of a of a peer assessment scheme and the same would be true of a benchmarking scheme. They may have different cycle lengths I suppose, but that's up to peer assessment coordinator or the benchmarking organization, but it but you are quite right that we have not said whether the self-declaration needs to be predominantly refreshed and of course it should, but we haven't said how often. So that's you know something needs to be thought through. And of course, you might even say the elephant in the room is this business is where a government's involved because it's difficult to audit your government, well you just have to hope that government has their own incentives to be to be credible.

Figueiredo, Reinaldo 40:27
Yeah, you're right. I mean what was asked about if this was one time and done, no, because you need to monitor and also the principles of schemes and standards, they need to be revised and when they are revised, need to go to the full process again.

Etty Feller 41:28
Thank you for sharing all the information and I will send you a letter, an e-mail later on, but I will appreciate if I can have all the documents that you use till now. The second issue is you should change the reference to IAF to the Global Accreditation Corporation Incorporate since From January 1st, IAF and ILAC will already established a new organization. The third thing I was wondering whether you did a survey or it's really a seminar work because at least I see one person on the call here who would like to register a new scheme for AI, so we can ask whether this list of objectives are applicable. But, in general, I think that the survey between those that are both well-known schemes and newcomers, this will give us more information about what they can and cannot do, and I totally agree that an accreditation is the best option since it's also mentioned in several Trade agreements.


Brett Hyland 43:22
Thank you, Etty. We'll have to consider how we might go about crafting a survey and what the what the audience would look like. Jeff and then Anil.

jeff.ruddle 43:39

Yeah, I was just listening I suppose to Phil's comments and thinking actually maybe part of the problem here, Brett, that we fall into having so much experience in these things is that there's stuff in here that we know, so we're not stating it as we take it for granted but perhaps some of the other people that are engaging with this haven't got that awareness of some of the principles of what's in there. So I'm hearing, you know, sort of questions talked about things like independence, impartiality, integrity, the fact that it's not a one and done type scheme. Is there something that we need to sort of state in this that kind of says what all this includes? So some of these key trust principles that people are hanging on and expecting to be there. OK, you should have independence, impartiality and a periodic review and I think we're kind of taking that for granted because we know all the standards that we're quoting here, the kind of things we know what the whole package includes, but not necessarily everyone who's going to be looking at it does.

Brett Hyland 44:51
Excellent point

AJ

Anil Jauhri 44:57
I just wanted to add something in reference to the government schemes which were mentioned. I was involved and so was Reinaldo in in in drafting of IAFMD 25 and we did say that government schemes do not need an evaluation, but we also said that ABS are encouraged to advise the governments to follow the same principles in their schemes. But I'm sure that if a government scheme was to come up for MLA endorsement in IAF or Global Accreditation Cooperation future, it will be subject to evaluation. If you want that kind of endorsement, you will be subject to evaluation. So we must be mindful of that, that if a government scheme decides that it would like endorsement of IAF because it wants to go international also, then it would be subject to an evaluation. Thank you.

Brett Hyland 45:47
Thank you. Excellent point, Gideon.

GR

Gideon Richards 45:51
Yeah, I think there's been some really good points here. One of the things I was saying to Reinaldo and Brett on the way through is I think there needs to be a more

detailed document that goes with this. It supports what this says to actually spell out what's just been picked up that it needs that clarity, it needs the transparency in in what we're actually looking for. I think that's an important part of it, so that everyone's clear on what we're talking about. Yes, Etty, we were very aware that the IAF ILAC names are changing, but we were sort of trying to keep it to things that everyone's familiar with at the moment. So yeah, I think it's a good starting point and you know it's some great comments to take on board. So as Jeff said, we've got that transparency in there in that clarity in all of all of what we're trying to do and provide.

Brett Hyland 47:09

So it's been a marvellous discussion, a lot of good ideas. I'll prepare the transcript and I'll circulate that shortly. But in the couple of minutes remaining, I'd like to ask if anyone has any views on what the next one or two steps are because we're actually all volunteers. You know, we've got day jobs. It's easy to say we should go away and write some, you know, lengthy explanatory document. But you know, who amongst us is actually going to be doing it? Anyway, what do people see as the immediate critical next step to continue to socialize this document, that is within our current resources.

PA

Phil Archer 48:03

I'll be very brief. I think we need experience. We need real world use cases. So just one is that we expect to be able to issue verifiable credentials in conformance with UNTP. Certainly, later than the first half of next year, hopefully before then, I would love to work with a relevant issuing body, CAB, ESG certificate body, whoever it may be, and to see how we can put these things together and do a real, real world project together. That would be a way that we can actually test these ideas, see what happens, put something in the in the world and try it out. I can do that as part of my day job that I get paid to do.

Z

Zach (Pyx) 48:49

Yeah, I was gonna say almost exactly the same thing as Phil and did want to bring it to the Responsible Business Alliance who kind of asked for this anyway and to test this with them because they're implementing UNTP and planning on issuing their conformity credentials in the first quarter next year and they want to include a scheme quality metric that that's because they view their scheme as high quality.

Compared to other sustainability schemes in the market. And so I think it's important to test it. I'm happy to test it with them as we go through the process.

Neil Savery 49:35
Yeah, it's it's similar. I was picking up on Etty's earlier point and then Phil's comment, which is kind of a proof of concept commentary, but in in saying what I'm about to say, declaring a conflict of interest that the organization I work for has as part of its operations a conformity assessment capability, testing, inspection, certification, and develops has a scheme for EPDs and is also runs the International Accreditation Service, which Etty would be familiar with. So, you've got within the International Code Council sort of almost the whole length of that table, but there would be potentially a conflict of interest there.

Figueiredo, Reinaldo 50:31
Yeah, but Neil here in this concept as you could see there, we there are possibilities of organization to be both the scheme owner and conformity assessment body in this.

Neil Savery 50:45
That's right. But what I'm saying is that the International Code Council is kind of all of them.


Brett Hyland 50:58
Well, as long as there's some Chinese walls there, Neil, you'll be right.

Neil Savery 51:01
Yeah, well, they operate with Chinese walls. I'm just being completely upfront. You could test it through an organisation that actually has just about all of those elements, capabilities.

Figueiredo, Reinaldo 51:12
Yeah, the more difficult case. See if it works!

David McNeil 51:47
Just picking up on what Bill and Zach were saying and sort of in similar to Neil's

comment is that on the call you've got myself and Andrew from a steel point of view. So potentially, we could do a sort of desktop exercise around steel. I think I saw similar in the comments there from Alison around textiles. I think maybe just some worked examples of what we're sort of what we're talking about in terms of practical examples might be a good thing to sort of test out the concepts that people are talking about.

Brett Hyland 52:34
You in agreement with that, Andrew?

AW **Andrew Wheeler** 52:52
I think I agree with Phil and and Zach and with what Dave was just saying, it's just finding some examples and trying to trying to pick holes in it to find where are the deficiencies. I think that's the next step, it's just moving forward that way.

Brett Hyland 53:18
Wonderful. So I think, I think I would also like to explore the possibility that that Etty raised about you know seeking some input maybe in the form of a survey. We may we may find it difficult ourselves to launch something but if anyone's aware of an organization that that might be in a better position to promulgate a survey amongst member bodies. We would certainly be interested I think in in any of that nature,

EF **Etty Feller** 54:00
Just to say that if there will be a survey, we will distribute it via Global Accreditation Cooperative.

Brett Hyland 54:09
So that would cover a good percentage of the schemes in the world, I guess. Well, that would be, that would be wonderful. That that might be the missing part of the puzzle. Ronaldo, you got a comment?

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 54:27
I mean, we what we put in that table is beyond the Global AC and IAF. It's far beyond. There are other things that exist there, like USGBC, and others, that I don't know, I'm not expert in everything here.

Brett Hyland 54:44

Oh, I see what you mean. Yes, the audience would be self-selecting in this case is what you're saying.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 54:45

Yeah, it's much more than IAF, It's broad.

Brett Hyland 54:51

Well, I mean it, it would be good feedback nonetheless, but you're right, it would be just be segment of the target audience, wouldn't it? Anyway, look, our time's gone. Let's keep our thinking caps on.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 55:04

And the other point, Brett, just to emphasize what I said, we don't want to be biased here, for others that are not in that in that universe, keeping them out. We need to need to be an organization that's broad.

Brett Hyland 55:30

Look, that's true. I don't think we're gonna solve all this today. Wonderful discussion and, please, as more thoughts occur to you, fire them over to me and I'll build them into some sort of response ready for the next meeting. Thank you all so much for your time and expertise today.

Brett Hyland stopped transcription