

Transcript

December 16, 2025, 8:03AM

Brett Hyland started transcription



Brett Hyland 0:15

Marta, are you able to introduce yourself?



Marta Martinezpardo 0:21

Thank you very much for the opportunity. My name is Martha Martinez Pardo. I'm working at PFC scheme owner program for the endorsement of forest certification. So the scheme owner in the forest sustainable forest management certification also in chain of custody in supply chains from forest to the end of the supply chain. I didn't know that the group already existed and I have read the document but I'm a bit puzzled about it so. Apologies in advance, I will just try to follow and see how I can contribute.



Brett Hyland 1:04

Well, thank you very much. It's clear that your experience and role is highly relevant to what we're, what we're grappling with in this group. OK, with introductions out of the way, the first substantive item was to be an update from Steve Capell who, as it turns out, is now unavailable. So he's asked if we can postpone that that agenda item. It dealt with the role of UNIDO and we in this group had already flagged a role for UNIDO that we hope they will fulfil, in regard to endorsing or recognizing scheme benchmarking organizations. Reinaldo, have you heard anything from UNIDO on the scheme benchmarking front?



Reinaldo Figueiredo 2:17

I have not, but Marta also participated in the group as well and I'm confident that they're going to issue the document, but I don't have any other information about when the document's going to be released.



Brett Hyland 3:04

Well we hope and expect they will publish the document. Actually we hope they'll take an active role in in setting up some sort of recognition framework for scheme benchmarking organisations. Steve Capell is in touch with them about this. Anyway, the next agenda item is the item that's been the focus of our energy over several months now. If I could reflect for a moment, this group has been going for five months now, perhaps many of us exactly sure of what to expect in terms of scope, but it quickly became apparent that there is a need to protect the integrity of UNTP

itself. And we have worked very hard on defining what I think is a pretty credible approach to recognising assurance over schemes. And it's probably a world first in some respects, but I have had feedback that it's still fairly technical in the eyes of non-experts. So possibly we could recognise that there remains opportunity to simplify the expression of our ideas. So if people have good ideas on that, then now's the time to discuss them. Before I open the floor for discussion, I just might ask Zach if he can tell us what are the UNTP deadlines for finalising this work?

Zach (Pyx) 5:23

Z Yeah. So basically we're trying to iterate the next release of the normative documents of the specifications pages to a version 0.7 and aiming for January 15th, or more realistically by the end January, then release the documents for public comment for 60 days, from February and March basically. This is to enable us to formally iterate to version 1.0 of UNTP at the plenary in May. And so that's kind of the schedule we're up against and next to one of the things that I've done is gone through the UNTP site and identified the documents that are normative and identified the documents that I thought were the conformity groups scope. That's the schedule and if I share up that issue, I can show us the ones that I thought were normative for our group. Let me share my screen, so for the conformity group it is the conformity credential and the sustainability vocabulary that were the two main normative ones. And then we would add an additional one, which is this assurance assessment framework as an additional normative page as well as potentially the sustainability groupings page, though that that one I think is still an open one.

 **Brett Hyland** 8:20

Right. Thank you, Zach. That sounds fine to me.

NS **Neil Savery** 8:24

Yeah, thanks, Zach. So just for clarity, the conformity assessment arrangements document, which was provided to us after the last meeting for us to socialise on a fairly confidential basis. Does the feedback for that have to fit into your normative document V 2.7 time frame which is the end of January?

 **Brett Hyland** 8:53

Yes, that's what we're aiming for. It's ridiculously tight.

NS **Neil Savery** 8:55

Yep, Yep. Just double checking.

Z **Zach (Pyx)** 8:58

But it's OK because we'll have two more months of public review to get additional

feedback. So it's not like we have to get it locked in stone by the end of January, but as good as we can get it.



Brett Hyland 9:21

Yeah so in the short time that remains, we have to think about how it would best be presented and, if there's an opportunity to simplify it, we can do that. But either way, we've been clear over several meetings that this group believes that this is an important part of UNTP and that something is lost if we do not define a basis for assuring conformity credentials. I'm not even sure if we'll have another meeting by then we may, I may share some correspondence in the intervening period for to invite comment. So, back to the group, it's time to invite you to let us know if you've had any feedback yourselves from socialising the draft amongst your networks. I know Gideon took it to ISO CASCO STAR, which is their strategic alliance and regulatory group. You've put something in the chat there, Gideon. Anything that you can add to your chat comment, were they interested at least?



Gideon Richards 11:01

Well, they'd just had Martina Paul do a similar DPP presentation beforehand and were running very late on time. And that presentation was a bit more technical, in terms of what they were trying to do in Switzerland. So I think we've sort of lost the opportunity to explain our document in any details, but we have shared it. I have a feeling they they're on a watching brief and they'll wait and see what happens. They're not as engaged as I'd like them to be with this. They've got other digital things that they seem to be more excited about with new standards coming out. I think it's going to need a little bit of an effort by Etty and myself maybe to sort of keep poking and prodding and making sure that they're aware of what's going on, but also that they see the importance of it. And just as an aside, yesterday I was with a friend who is in sustainability and she's thinking, oh, that would be the next big thing and therefore I would like to be involved with this, I might move into this field in terms of digital passport. So, it is getting some excitement out there in various different ways, but I'm not sure that ISO CASCO really see the full benefit yet,



Etty Feller 13:01

Thank you. Agree with all what Gideon said, but I think that we should also say that the plan is that during the next plenary there will be a scheme workshop or scheme day or something like this and we offer to share information with this group to have more information from different organizations that look at this issue and the requirements for a scheme. They seemed a little bit reluctant because they thought

that my suggestion was meant to have the to give the floor to different scheme owners and we explained that that no, no, the aim is to bring to the room as much scheme owners as possible, just that they will understand that not all scheme owner are working to ISO standard. Not all scheme owners are IAF recognized, just to open the box for understanding that there are a lot of other schemes out there that they are not aware of. And as Gidon said, we didn't feel that there will was much enthusiasm to cooperate.



Brett Hyland 14:51

Yes, it's true, isn't it, that we're straddling two different worlds. We think we've done a reasonable job of joining these two worlds, but it's unfamiliar territory for most as people live in one of one of those worlds, the formal CASCO world or the unregulated sustainability world. We've tried very hard to recognise and accommodate both systems, both frameworks.



Etty Feller 15:12

If I may add, I think that the issue is not CASCO versus all the rest. The issue is the fragmentation. Sustainability has one and two, inspection of goods has one and two and other areas of expertise has more than one or two groups, so we try to convince them that they should open the floor, that the audience will be as diverse as possible so they will listen to the guidance or the toolbox of Casco, but still be aware that there are out there other schemes that don't need Casco because they are part of trade agreement, or they are part of government, or they are they are part of a huge International Consortium of Goods.



Brett Hyland 16:23

Exactly. Now we've got Gideon and then Alison, please.



Gideon Richards 16:29

Yeah, I was just going to follow through on Etty's point. I think you're right. I think the difficulty is that they find it hard to get the idea that other people do things without them. Why would you do anything without the CASCO toolbox? And so, you know, it's almost like they need convincing that there's another world out there that can actually function. And if they were really thinking about it, then this is a golden opportunity to actually engage with those other organizations. And we had conversations about IFRS and other organisations and you know it's very difficult to be able to get that good relationship building going



Alison-GlobalCircular Network 18:03

I have two things to um to bring today. One is that I created a UNTP value chain map

for the textile-based products that was modelled from the one introduced in the communications group that was metals.

I will share with this group because I thought this was part of the other communications group, but I've received zero response and I put a lot of time and effort into it, so I would love to put it to this group to see if I can get some feedback on that. It does marry the UNTP structure. To that point, I am pleased to say that I have the interest of a Bangladesh consulting firm that really does marry our vision and who are very interested in the UNTP. They are working with 500 major garment, textile, spinning, knitting, dyeing, washing and accessories factories, as well as connecting the resource recovery and the circularity at the end for the recycling. So we've had some amazing conversations and we're at the next point of putting the steps in place to be able to bring the teams together and they have a particular interest in folding in UNTP. So anyone in this group that would like to participate with me, please do.



Brett Hyland 19:51

We do want to, Alison. In fact, that's it is an outstanding action for our group to find ways of engaging with other groups. We had in our mind that we need to first create a terms of reference and all the rest of it, but if there's an offer that's sitting there, then we'll gladly accept that. So, you can assume that I would like to be involved and probably Zach and maybe others.

AN

Alison-GlobalCircular Network 20:09

Fantastic.

Z

Zach (Pyx) 20:18

Yeah. And Allison, I've just sent you an e-mail apologizing for being a little bit slack on responding to you and suggesting we catch up in the next day or so to go through some of that stuff. So, let's get something in the diary. Happy to happy to support you through that process. So apologies on that.

AN

Alison-GlobalCircular Network 20:23

Thank you. They do want to move quickly, as I've had great feedback. Thank you.

Z

Zach (Pyx) 20:37

Yep. And then I do want to flag something else. So one of the things that happens is people talk about DPPS a lot, and UNTP of course does have DPPS digital product passports, but actually the fact that we're straddling multiple worlds with conformity credentials and traceability events and identity anchors and identity like it's a much more complete solution. I think it's helpful to articulate all that whenever we're

discussing UNTP and even this assurance assessment framework makes the solution more complete for businesses and organizations to take on to resolve some of the challenges that they're facing when it comes to sharing data in a interoperable way. And then in terms of the assurance assessment framework, I do have a couple of conversations ongoing, have not received any specific feedback yet, but will be over the next over the coming weeks.

AZ **Adrienna Zsakay** 21:54

Yes, just in response to Alison's comment, and I'm not sure this is the right forum because this is really the conformity meeting. But the reason to include that particular visual or image in the last agenda item meeting was simply to highlight how the term digital product passports are used. And the focus in our communications group is really the website, so that that's still what we're working on. We've nearly finished the first section, it's turned out to be a little bit longer than I thought. I understand that the meeting that we have is very late for you, Alison. So next year we're going, I'm going to send out a new timetable. So if you want to pick a time that makes it easier for you to attend end, you're most welcome to do that. But there wasn't enough people who responded, so we made the meeting at that time.

RF **Reinaldo Figueiredo** 23:09

Thank you Gideon and and Ety to share with us what was the reaction in the CASCO STAR. I think it's finally now that some of the members of that group realize that there are a lot of other scheme owners out there, many benchmark organizations, government organization that does not use ISO CASCO, so the document that was drafted here can be a tool, a mechanism, to show those organizations the importance of the CASCO standards. We were aware that there are many organizations that does not follow those CASCO principles, but as you can see by the documents, I'm sure they saw by the document that many doc, many reference, many examples are ISO CASCO and that is a good thing. At least some of them realize that there are worlds beyond their vision.

 **Brett Hyland** 24:35

That's my feeling too. If nothing else, we are revealing to both worlds the existence of the other world, and I and I think that's a very useful process. Now, Reinaldo, I saw in the chat that you've distributed this assessment assurance approach to 400 scheme owners. Can I ask how on earth you came up with a list that long?

 **Reinaldo Figueiredo** 24:59

Yeah, the reason is, with my hat with ANSI National Accreditation Board, we have meetings with scheme owners for many, many years. And we started formally to have an annual with scheme owners meeting five years ago. It's scheme owners of all over the world, including Martha here with PFC, she's here because of that hundreds of emails that I sent. I received a lot of good feedback, people saying, oh, this is good to have the opportunity to provide comments. Also the International Scheme Owners Association as well we, I received a mail from them saying thanks and that they're looking for the opportunity to make comments on the document, I think this was good.

 **Brett Hyland** 26:16

Great. Not that I've been overwhelmed with feedback myself, but the date that I gave in in the email that Rinaldo sent was the 31st of December, so I suppose I may yet be overwhelmed with feedback.

 **Marta Martinezpardo** 26:51

Just wanted to follow up and regarding the feedback, I understand you are seeking for feedback on the document that I received. It's a 3 pages document with details and notes. OK, maybe from my experience that I just jumped into this meeting today and I received the information thanks to Reynaldo by email. I think digital passports are very relevant and are going to be very relevant for all the schemes. For certain, sustainability is something that we need to look at, but we may not have yet sufficient knowledge. So when we receive the email, we may not be ready to jump in and provide feedback. I was wondering whether you are planning to conduct webinars or something with additional explanation and to frame better in order for those scheme owners to be able to provide feedback and to point you to the right people to provide feedback.

 **Brett Hyland** 27:46

Well, yeah, that would be nice. Now in terms of feedback, look it is a bit unfortunate that our public review starts in a few weeks. So you know if we get this document into good shape, at least we will have the formal public review over that two-month period and we'll react accordingly to whatever response we get. The opportunity that Reinaldo alerted you to Marta was just an informal opportunity, just over the next couple of weeks, where if people thought there was something wrong with the direction, then let us know ahead of our formal public comment.

GR **Gideon Richards** 29:30

Yeah, just thinking, given that you've already helped Reinaldo draft some communication, would it be worth sharing that around this group so we could have a consistent sort of message to go out to anyone we're sending it out to? Then on a YouTube channel type thing, could we do a quick, you know, a 5 minute little video that could be, you know, linked to somewhere and sent around? There must be some way we can host it just with maybe yourself, Brett and one other, you know, maybe talking through what we're trying to do and linking it to the document in January.

 **Brett Hyland** 30:21

So, well, maybe. I just want to say that although this document we drafted is very important to us and we've worked extremely hard on it, particularly Reinaldo and Gideon over recent months, it is ultimately only a small part, an important part, I would even say a critical part, but still a small part of the overall UNTP. And it's the whole UNTP framework that that is going out for public comment, including conformity credentials, digital product passports, digital traceability events, all linked through verifiable data points along an entire data chain. It's a complex beast and I don't think it's right that we should try and steal the spotlight and focus just on our assessment assurance component, which is really just a cog in this machine.

AZ **Adrienna Zsakay** 31:23

Yeah, just quickly to answer Marta. Marta, I head up the communications training and guidance work packages within UNTP and so getting feedback from people like you about what you would like to see, because we're just in the process of reviewing all the text on the website and working out how do we make it more user friendly and how do we create videos just like what Gideon's talking. It would be really great to have you perhaps participate in a couple of our meetings so that you can bring to us what you need to know. Because if we're not getting feedback, if I'm not getting feedback from individuals or from groups or from scheme owners about what they need to know, then we can't craft the right communications tools and training and guidance tools without that constructive feedback.

 **Brett Hyland** 32:33

And Zach, do you want to bring this conversation to a close because we do have other agenda items today?

Z **Zach (Pyx)** 32:41

Yes. Well, I was going to say I do run a webinar every month talking about. I can

share a link to a public YouTube channel that has a bunch of material attached to it. And I'm running one tomorrow morning, Sydney time, probably not good time for you, Marta, but tomorrow's session is about running pilots. But next month I could probably talk about how we are finalizing and getting this ready for public comment around the trust components of UNTP. The reason that we put this assurance assessment framework together is to make sure that people who were claiming that they were UNTP compliant and things like that had, at least have some basis and validation associated with that. So the assessment assurance framework wouldn't be the only component to that presentation, because there's other aspects of UNTP that reinforce that, including conformity credentials themselves. So I'm happy to set that up for next month and share it with the group as well. And I'll put a link to the YouTube channel in the chat if folks are interested.



Brett Hyland 33:53

Thank you. Now I did just pop into the chat the e-mail that I sent Reinaldo that he was then able to forward on to his hundreds of scheme owners.



Z Zach (Pyx) 34:12

Brett, can I put that e-mail link into our Git repository just so that people have it? If are you comfortable with that?



Brett Hyland 34:13

Yeah oh sure. So, we have a few outstanding action items. They've sort of dropped off the radar a bit, because of the what we viewed as the critically important work around assessment assurance. Anyway, we've brought it to a point now, so in the minutes remaining I would like to pick up one of the quite long standing items which is how we how we refer to, or how schemes can refer to, externally published standards in a way that will result in different schemes referring to the same external standard in the same way, so that machines can match them and know that's the same standard that these two different schemes are referring to. That there's a basis for comparability between credentials that might be issued under different schemes by different cabs. We hadn't made huge progress really, but Phil has kindly put something together, which I think is based on some existing arrangement and hopefully you've had a chance to read that. So we'll discuss Phil's proposal in just a moment, but the other the other thing that you need to be aware of - I'm just going to share my screen now - is that we have an existing data model. Hopefully you can see that on the screen now, this is just a zoomed in view of the Logical Model, can you see UNTP standard there? It has four data fields and that's the current data

capture model. So one thing we can ask if whether Phil's schema will squeeze into those four data points, or if we think we need to create more data points, or if we can get away without some of the fields that Phil has suggested. So the fields are: The URI, a web address or a more generalized URI, then name of the document, which I think Phil calls the Title, then the issuing party, which Phil calls Publisher and lastly the issue date which I think is self-explanatory.

 **Etty Feller** 37:07

Just a question, can it be a standards number and no name?

 **Brett Hyland** 37:15

Yeah, the same thing had occurred to me Etty. In Phil's example, he puts the number first and then the name and he wraps it all up into what he calls the title. So that that's Phil's schema. Now you know whether we saw merit in separating the number from the title is a matter for discussion

 **Phil Archer** 37:34

I should, I should say, first of all, I wrote this in a hurry. It was kind of, Oh my God, it's the end of Monday and tomorrow morning Brett's going to ask me, have you done that thing you said you'd do months ago? So, it's this whatever is written down, it was designed to elicit conversation and discussion. Please don't take it as a hey, this is what I think we should definitely do. Very, very much open to discussion. And you've already hit on a couple of things there, Brett. So, does it fit the data model that's already in the UNTP data model? Yes, change the names. I don't care. But are we also talking about how you would refer to those standards in the document with prose or something else? So different use cases for where you want to refer, what your use cases for referring to the standard might make a difference. And to Etty's question, if I'm writing a prose document, I'm going to put in square brackets ISO/IEC 12345 and then down the bottom there'll be a list of references and it says ISO/IEC 12345 and then below that all the stuff we've got. So, depends on what you're doing if it's useful to separate out the number from the prose title. We can do that. Nothing here is written in stone. It was designed to start a conversation and I think we need to be clear what the are we trying to come up with a universal way to refer to stuff. By the way, people have been doing this for centuries. It's not a new idea, so let's not kidd us, we're the first people to face this. Or are we in particularly in the data model, in which case the data model is already there, frankly, is fine.

 **Brett Hyland** 39:19

Yeah. So I think the key use case is that we can machine match the same standard that's referred to by different parties. To deal with the risk that one party might put ISO 'space' IEC and someone else might put ISO 'slash' IEC, you know all the things that can go wrong that'll ruin the machine matching ability.

NS **Neil Savery** 39:48

Thanks, Brett. And it's probably a question to yourself and Phil, but it's a matter of first principle. It goes back to my historic confusion about standards, that is scheme owner standards and what we regard as standards developed by standards development organisations. So Phil, looking at the document you've produced, my reading of that is it's very much directed at standards development organisations. And so can I confirm we are talking about those standards, not the standards that are part of schemes? Yeah, OK.



Brett Hyland 40:25

Yes, we are. We're only talking about those standards. Only talking about externally published SDO generated standards. Because we already have a nice system for scheme vocabularies where they refer to their own standards. And if a scheme is referring to their own standards, then if somebody else needs to refer to it they can just use whatever digital identifier the scheme has already generated. But the problem we have with these SDO generated standards is they all do it differently and some don't seem to do it at all. So, we we need something that'll bring consistency.

NS **Neil Savery** 41:06

Sure. Yeah and on that basis I think what Phil's done is a is a great piece of work. Thank you.



Gideon Richards 41:22

Yeah, thanks and thanks Phil for this good start on it. I just had a few comments like I had to read it three or four times because get my head round it as well. But a couple of things, one from an ISO standards world is that FDIS aren't public, so therefore it would be difficult for a standard to be referenced in that way where someone could actually get access to it. So just sort of thinking from that basis, if it's only ever the published ones that are available to people, whether they have to buy it or otherwise is a different matter, but if they're only the published ones, then they should be relatively fixed in terms of their unique identifier for part of it. I think we've picked up on the point just now that you know it's very difficult relying on people to put all this information in themselves. If they put it in in a slightly different way, how do we get that consistency and who's going to police it. And lastly, can we bring things

together so that you have to have two unique references working in tandem to actually make it something valid. So maybe that's the very poor way of putting it, but for example, date and the title concatenated together might give you a valid combination. I was just wondering if there's something we could do in that relationship that would make a more verifiable document in terms of date or whether we need a version number and just to go to your point about SDOs and scheme documents. From my experience, having once been a scheme owner, we didn't have any SDO documents for installers of renewable energy technologies when we started so we wrote the things and effectively we were an SDO in the UK writing those and sort of became the authority for our own scheme, but also for others who were looking at linking to it like government. So I'm just sort of wondering how we ensure that all of that gets linked together or gets able to be pointed at in an appropriate way. I think it's a great start. It made me think I have to say.



Brett Hyland 44:34

Yeah Gideon, my brain went in the same direction as yours, Gideon. So we could probably have a drop-down list, or code list, of publishers because there aren't that many in the world and if someone was missing, well, we could always add it. There might be other things as well to help maintain data quality, but Rinaldo's made the very sensible comment in the chat that we have AI, so maybe that's part of the marrying up the data fields which we wouldn't even have thought of three years ago when we started down this path.

RF

Reinaldo Figueiredo 44:58

This is reality that AI can help us, can help UNTP and it's not very expensive. And the other point that I included here that there are many schemes that they are digital. It's a process like in carbon footprint, in GHG protocols, they are digital. They are not what we are used to. We need to be differentiate because all the ABs in the world today are challenged to review those schemes or those protocols. You know what I mean? I think that's coming, not waiting for you to open the door for them, they opened the door itself.

EF

Etty Feller 46:04

I don't want to waste the last couple of minutes, but I just want to echo what Gideon said, what Reinaldo said, use a list like a combo box that they can tick. And last but not least, we have to be aware that the business model of using ISO standards is going to change and in this case we have to be ready that some users of those

standards either will change it to home-based or they will issue their own standard for their own scheme.



Very interesting. I didn't know that.



Phil Archer 46:51

Very briefly then to respond to some of the points raised for everybody. Thank you. First of all, I was to say, just to emphasize what I wrote was designed to start a conversation, not as a proposal. Very much open to all this and what is already highlighted is a difference between the way different SDOS operate I've highlighted, the ones I know best. There are many more that I know nothing about, but people, those organizations have a different method of publishing and so on. The date issue actually is more complicated than you might think, because organizations like mine and W3C and other people will give you a URL that always points to the latest version, which changes over time. So what's the date on that? Is it the date of the first publication that was 30 years ago, or is it the one that you just looked at last? The date of publication actually is movable because you're using a URL that points to the latest version, which may change. Unless you want to always refer to the immutable versioned document, which never changes, you put a date on that and so on. So those things become what are you trying to achieve. In terms of the drop down lists, I referred in the very beginning of that document to a thing called Specref. Specref is a database of SDO driven standards and it gives you this same way to refer to it and all the data about it. So you can literally just use that as a consistent way to refer to those standards and we could potentially add to that. As again, this is not a new problem. One thing that might be helpful both for some of these standards we're talking about and for the schemes we're talking about, a thing called DOI. I don't know how many of you are familiar with DOI digital object identifiers. They the identifier is digital, the thing itself can be anything, including but not limited to digital assets, and they are designed to be persistent. They always redirect to something or other, and it may be that the use of DOI becomes useful if you want an identifier for something, that will persist literally beyond your lifetime. Then DOI's might be the answer.



Brett Hyland 49:07

This is by far the most substantive conversation on the topic that we've had to date. I think we've probably put most of the problems on the table, perhaps we are even halfway towards a solution. You've given us a wonderful start on this, Phil. Thank you so much. I think we'll we'll cogitate on this between now and the next meeting. I

might see if I can annotate the version that you've sent with some ideas and perhaps we get even closer at the at the next meeting to something that we think might be workable. Now we don't have very much longer, but I would like to see if we could close out one action if possible, which is the question of whether we can split the list of conformity topics, or sustainability topics, whatever we want to call them, from the conformity credential page, because they're kind of different beasts and one potentially could keep changing quite frequently.

Z **Zach (Pyx)** 50:10

I thought we had agreed to that when we changed the name of sustainability vocabulary catalog to scheme vocabulary because we talked, took that out and put it in a different spot. I haven't actually affected that decision, but yes, my my expectation is it's a different base.

 **Brett Hyland** 50:22

Good. All right. And the second part of that same open action was to ask if there is any clarity on whether our group retains ownership of that classification list or topic list, or whether someone else has put their hand up for it.

Z **Zach (Pyx)** 50:48

Nobody has put their hand up for it at this point, Brett, I think. So one of the actions I have is probably to add that topic to the list for discussion on Thursday at the steering group. And if you'd like me to, I can put somebody else's name next to it.

 **Brett Hyland** 50:51

Well, does anyone, does anyone in our group have a feeling on this, do we wish to maintain the list of sustainability topics which in theory could grow in time to include all conformity topics, not just sustainability. Is that a role you think that sits well within our group? Any thoughts on that?

GR **Gideon Richards** 51:24

Yeah, I actually think it does. And the reason being that it is such a wide subject area, but it all comes back to that credibility of it and how do you make sure that whatever's done is credible and so whether it's ESG or it's greenhouse gases or you know, the next thing that comes along, they all need credibility and we're the group sort of that seems it feels like it's there to check and make sure that credibility is underlying everything. It's not meant to be boasting about us in any way, but it just that's what our role really is in terms of the conformity that you can actually conformity assess it or accredit it or whatever. And therefore I think that makes sense for us to look at it that way and we'll maybe have a different view of it than other

people who would sort of look at it and go, OK, well, we can write that, but then we would then go, well, what does that mean? How would you actually, you know, conformity assess it?



Brett Hyland 52:35

Yeah, I happen to agree, Zach. It sounds like we want it, unless there's any dissenting voice before we before we wrap up today? No? All right, let do that.

So, please continue to socialise our assessment assurance approach with anyone you like. You've seen the text of my e-mail in the chat, feel free to use that. Between now and the 15th of January I'll see if I can respond to the feedback about simplifying the presentation of our assessment assurance, to get it into a form that I think could reasonably be uploaded to the website ready for the full public review. I'll give you at least a week to provide expert comment, so please keep an eye out for that.



NS Neil Savery 53:51

Yeah, I was just going to make the observation, Brett, in terms of simplification, the conformity assessment assurance framework or methodology that that although it's obviously going to change based on feedback and further work, I think that's a really useful illustrative way of simplifying what it is we're about. I appreciate there's a narrative that has to sit over the top of all of that, and there are other pieces of work that are part of this, but I just wanted to give you that feedback that I found that a very simple and easy piece of work to to communicate to other people.



Brett Hyland 54:35

That is very gratifying actually. And I confess that the feedback that I've had about the complexity was from people outside the conformity space. So thank you Neil. All right. 2 minutes left. Any any thoughts before we wrap up the year that was and set our sights towards public review next year? Any thoughts that people would like to share with the group?



Z Zach (Pyx) 55:06

Brett, I'd like to thank you for leading this group very, very effectively and driving the results and you've done an amazing job coalescing and solving some really tough problems. So really appreciate that work that you've put in and the support you've given all of us.



Brett Hyland 55:22

Yes, they have been tough problems but we have an amazing group of experts that have helped us find a path through Gideon.

 **Gideon Richards** 55:31

Yeah, I was just going to say, you know, I'll follow that through, but also a thank you to you for coming and reaching out to the likes of CASCO. You know, I wouldn't have clicked on to this group or what was going on without it. And there's an amazing group of people to engage with, so thanks for that.

 **Brett Hyland** 55:54

Well, that sounds like a very nice way to draw this meeting to a close. Thank you again for your participation today. Thank you for your expert contributions over the five month journey so far and I hope that you'll stay involved for many meetings to come. All the best for the for the for the break and I hope you enjoy, enjoy your holidays. Thank you.

 **Brett Hyland** stopped transcription