UNTP-Conformity Mtg#8 (virtual)
3 December 2025

Attendance
       Brett Hyland
       Etty Feller
       Reinaldo Figueiredo
       Gideon Richards
       Ulas Nalbantoglu
       Zach Zeus
       Neil Savery
       Georgia Alsop
       Adrienna Zsakay
       Phil Archer
       Anil Jauhri
       Rama Ha
       Alison Jose

1. Welcome & Rules of participation (BH)
2. New participant intro - Rama Ha
3. Discussion topic:

Decide if the draft Conformity Assurance Guide is ready to be socialised beyond our own group

       Discussion indicated broad support for the Assessment Assurance approach that was circulated ahead of the meeting. A number of upcoming external stakeholder mtgs were identified that would provide opportunities for socialising the concepts.

       New action : Write intro for the UNTP Assessment Assurance doc to provide context and then get Steering Committee permission to commence preliminary consultancy. Updated doc sent to group on 5/12 with approval to socialise within our networks - **Action to be closed**

       New action: Raise Gitlab issue for incorporating UNTP Assessment Assurance as a normative part of UNTP. Issue #563 raised and Updated document linked on 5/12 - **Action to be closed**

Previous action items completed:

- Problem with selecting national delegation for CEFACT Expert registration - Zach advises this interface is now stable - **Action closed**
- Gitlab Issue #79 (open) has been discussed in terms of credible processes for gathering human observations to form conclusions (such as human welfare). It was agreed that work just completed by the UNTP-Conformity group in defining credible scheme evaluation represents a possible resolution of this issue - **Action closed**

       Note: Gitlab Item #79 has since been annotated as follows:

       The UNTP-Conformity group has been discussing closely related matters to Issue#79 over the past few months. In relation to 'accumulating evidence of ethical participation' through mechanisms other than formal audits, this does

seem a worthy goal and yet to be packaged as a conformity credential it would still need to be structured and managed through some set of processes (let's call this a 'scheme', which is the formal term in ISO CASCO). The UNTP-Conformity group has been working hard on describing what a credible scheme should look like, in terms of: scheme development/management, governance, standards development, competency of personnel and oversight of conformity assessment (**refer to Issue #563 for more detail**). *While the UN wouldn't wish to be involved in judging schemes, there are classes of organisations who carry out this exactly this function.*

So, such a human welfare scheme has the option of issuing conclusions that depend on a user's own belief in the value of the scheme (ie, does not align with UNECE Rec49 principles), or the scheme could submit to an evaluation of their scheme by a recognised authority such that there is alignment with REC49 principles.

In terms of the other matter raised in the thread above, that of an isolated, stand-alone, human observation, this doesn't really sound like the subject of a conformity credential. Perhaps a record of such an observation could be used as one form of 'evidence' which might be linked directly from a claim that is contained in a DPP or DFR.

Outstanding action item list:

1. (Updated) Scope the terms of engagement with the conformity credential implementors previously nominated by the subgroup and have Zach approach those groups - BH & ZZ to draft ToR
2. (Updated) Articulate a framework for referencing SDO-published standards such that everyone can digitally reference these in the same way, regardless of who's doing the implementation - PA to liaise with BH
3. (Updated) Seek advice on whether the Conformity Topic Classification can be moved to its own Gitlab page as it isn't exclusive to the Scheme Vocab subject and also note that the Waste Framework Directive is missing from the list of references (ZZ action)
4. (Updated) If a particular scheme requires all CABs assessing to their scheme to use a hierarchical structure for criteria then should this be accommodated as an extension (Gitlab open issue #344) or must we update the Core conformity credential structure (Subgroup action)
5. (Update) Establish whether the scheme header/vocab structure allows reference to scheme assurance pathways and seek to have the Logical Model updated in not (BH & ZZ action)
6. Steve Capell is to investigate any implications for UNTP information security in light of the EU CapGemini initiative (SC action)