

Transcript

February 10, 2026, 7:56AM

 **Brett Hyland** 6:23

We've just gone three minutes past the hour. I think it's time to start. A pretty interesting agenda I think today.

 **Brett Hyland** 6:40

Those on the call I think are a mixture of registered UNCFACT experts and observers. You have different contributing rights when it comes to the GitLab site. but I think for the purposes of this meeting, your participation is welcome regardless. An important thing to remember is that you if you have intellectual property that you wish to preserve, you should not be sharing it in this forum because by doing so you are gifting that intellectual property to the UN, as many of us have been doing for some years. There is a code of conduct should you be interested in reading it and because I'm transcribing these meetings, I would ask that no unauthorised AI notetakers be used please, so that we have a single official meeting record.

Ok to orient ourselves, a reminder that our group, the UNTP Conformity Group, is part of the wider United Nations Transparency Protocol project and within our subgroup we are interested in the question of substantiating claims that are made about a product or a facility or an organisation. Which leads us naturally into the world of conformity assessment.

Now there are two main digital structures that our group is tasked with managing. One is the scheme vocabulary, which is the set of things that a scheme says about itself, and we have a structure for that. The other important digital structure that we are tasked with administering is the conformity credential, which is the digital output from an assessment that is being performed according to a scheme. So, because we're going to be concentrating on the conformity credential structure today, I'll just remind you that the logical model for the conformity credential was defined much earlier, years ago actually, and quite a few on this call were involved in that as well. So really our group now is just clarifying the meaning of certain terms. One of the most important terms, is assessment assurance. So that corresponds in the logical model to something called Assessment level. We've been defining that from a technical standpoint over some months now. Having essentially nussed out the

technical meaning of assessment assurance, we're now preparing the conformity credential web page for public comment, which I think has now been pushed back to the end of March. We have a little bit of time to discuss how we're presenting this work to the wider public.

I might just go back a step to remind us where we came from. I hope you can see this, here is the Word document we circulated late last year, leading up to Christmas time. Looking back now, it looks a bit of a mess, doesn't it? It made sense to us at the time but, looking back, it was a bit confronting to non-experts. We have used the intervening time to, I hope, make this structure more understandable and in the process I also think more precise. There were some ambiguities and nuances buried in that in that original Table that weren't immediately obvious, but as we worked to to clarify the presentation, we became aware of overlaps and ambiguity which we've been about to resolve.

Anyway, here is where we're up to today, as you would have seen from material circulated ahead of the meeting. One of the interesting additions is the plus sign and the equals sign. So the idea is that even someone who's not too familiar with this stuff can understand that there are scheme evaluation options at the top and then you add to that the conformity assessment assurance type and this equates to an assessment level.

We see in the assessment level descriptors that assurance either derives from the scheme itself or from some authority. It's not up to our group to say what is an acceptable assurance level. That's up to the user of a conformity credential. But the user of conformity credential should understand that they either have to look at the scheme to understand the assurance or they have to look at the authority. So, our job is to either point them to the scheme documentation or point them to the relevant authority, so they can understand the nature of assurance behind the conformity credential that they are consuming as a user. So, naturally enough, the scheme-derived assurances derive from a conformity assessment type involving actions by the scheme owner, which ultimately link back to a self-declaration about their own scheme.

The other thing that I should explain is that the assessment level result is something that would be attached to the conformity credential. So the issuer of the conformity credential will voluntarily assign one of these categories, but in doing so they need to be able to justify that so the conformity credential that they issue must additionally linked to something that corresponds to this middle row, the relevant

type of endorsement. So that's as far as the conformity credential goes, but the conformity assessment itself is performed under the auspices of a scheme and so the other component here in the table is whether the scheme is self-declared or if there some sort of other arrangement or endorsement in place over the scheme and such information is accessed from the scheme vocabulary. But the point is that, taken together, this digital trail will serve to substantiate whatever assessment assurance description has been made by the by the issuer of the conformity credentials. I might just stop sharing and open that up to discussion.

AZ **Adrienna Zsakay** 16:46

Sorry to ask you to put that diagram back because you have a reference to notes. Where are you going to position those notes? On the webpage, are you going to put it underneath the diagram? Are you going to put it at the bottom or will there be a separate section on the website that you will click onto that and then people can go to that note?

BH **Brett Hyland** 17:24

I'll show you what I'm sending to Zach. Now what Zach does with that, I'm not sure, but I will put on the screen now what I intend to send to him. OK, hopefully you you can see that. So the there is an existing page on the UNTP site called Conformity Credential and so this section is going to be the final part of that page. Hopefully appended to the bottom of the existing Conformity Credential page.

AZ **Adrienna Zsakay** 18:22

OK, alright, OK.

ZZ **Zachary Zeus** 19:17

I'm happy to add to that though, just to give you everybody a sense of what I am going to do. Because the digital conformity credential page is a normative page, we are going to be following the approach of the rest of the UNTP page so we may want to think about where we put informative or helpful information that doesn't make that cut. And so that's going to be something that's part of the feedback I'll bring back to this group once we agree on this is content, so that everybody here is comfortable and then we can identify additional things we want to add to informative pages.

BH **Brett Hyland** 20:18

And we do have a bit of time for that process.

EF **Etty Feller** 20:23

Thank you. I just want to echo and to say that following what was at the previous project that I was part of, I'm not sure if it's followed the editing requirement. So we can say we would we wish to do it like so and so, but the editing group, they will edit the document following what is usually done and we had this issue also in the previous document.

BH **Brett Hyland** 21:00

Yeah, we certainly did Etty, that's bringing back a few memories.. So we'll see how all this lands. But I think we have a clear idea of what we're trying to say. And so I think, you know we can get our intent through to the end of the process.

AG **Alison GCN** 21:21

Yes, I have a question in relation to the standards and the certifications that are listed there.. I wasn't able to see it quickly enough, but are they lumped together according to specific industries because we are dealing with many different industries there. Like there's ISO, there's, you know, when it comes to textiles, organic, for example.

BH **Brett Hyland** 21:46

So, I think, it's pretty important to remember that these are not certification standards. Certification standards are the standards that a certification body will use to make an assessment. Rather, these ones are standards that are used to assess a scheme, or elements of a scheme. And so they mostly apply across all sectors, although of course there are some like you know ISEAL for example that are specific to sustainability, but again across all product groups within sustainability. It's at a level higher than maybe you were first thinking.

AG **Alison GCN** 22:26

Yes, possibly and possibly not, but it just is a a point. It was a little confusing from that point. Thank you. I can I just also just point for now I'm actually in the process of introducing this to our new IT team to create this structure and so when we're

looking at one specific industry textile based products it is really quite difficult to, you know, direct them towards just to our industry as opposed to the mixture of industries, that's all.

 **Brett Hyland** 23:17

I would doubt there would be any textile specific standards listed there. If any such do exist and they're relevant, we'd be interested in adding them.

 **Alison GCN** 23:25

Oh, OK. I'm saying more like, for example, the factory certifications, the standards imposed upon the, oh what do they call the digital factory certifications?

 **Brett Hyland** 23:35

Yeah, you've dropped down a level though. You're now talking about the certification level. We're talking about the evaluation of the scheme that administers those kind of particular certification standards that might be applied.

 **FR Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 24:13

The point here is those standards does not go to that level that Alison mentioned, the technical requirements for textile for standards that's going to be used in EPDs Environmental Product Declaration, it does not go to that level. It's about if I'm going to create a scheme, what is the governance that? Organizations need to have, you know what I mean?

 **AG Alison GCN** 24:56

Does that include, for example, JTC 24 for the standards for the DPPs for example? Is that what you mean?

 **FR Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 25:03

No, no. It's just for instance, this example that I said if, say Neil & I, wanted to develop a scheme, then we develop standards. So how are we going to manage that, what are the principles in terms of managing the process of receiving comments. So we are talking about principles, not going into the detail of which standard we're going to use for this specific scheme, that part is determined by the market.

 **GR Gideon Richards** 25:44

Yeah. So, I'll try a slightly different way of doing of saying it and maybe you'll feel more comfortable. So I've run a certification scheme in the UK for renewables and micro generation technology in the past and so the scheme documents that we were working off and we were linked to government. We were under 17067 and 17065 as the scheme requirements documents. So, anything underneath that that the cabs were doing would have been under those would be under those. Now we had a whole load of other technical standards for factory production control, for technologies, for solar and PV and all the rest of them. But here we're talking about the how would you assess whether they were following '67 for the scheme.

 **Brett Hyland** 27:13

Gideon, you probably should say ISO IEC 17067, not just 67, right?

 **GR Gideon Richards** 27:21

Yes, I should. So these are the CASCO standards at that level that we're talking about and that would be the thing that we're looking at here in terms of a scheme and how they've actually set themselves up, have they got the right integrity, have they got the right structures in place, do they have a legal entity that's appropriate, etcetera. And so anything underneath that is what Ronaldo and Brett are saying. So I hope that that maybe helps as well.

 **FR Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 28:04

Yeah, I I just compliment here and then we go up another level to the benchmarking document that Brett sent to all of you that was developed by UNIDO to define the process that a scheme benchmarking organization can have to benchmark schemes because that document from UNIDO, there was no other document in any country. or international organization that define specific. If you are a benchmarking organization, what is governance you need to have? What is principles of transparency? What is your process in place? You know what I mean? You will have appeals, you have complaints. So as you can see, that defines competence of that benchmark organization.

 **NS Neil Savery** 29:17

I had a question about the UNIDO benchmarking document, which I read today and I found really useful. And I was going to ask a question about how it related to the assessment assurance document, but I just read Note 11 and now I've answered my question. Thank you.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 29:50

One point that we're talking here, without the notes, it's difficult to understand the document.

NS **Neil Savery** 29:57

Absolutely. I completely agree.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 30:06

Need to link to those digital page or information, because if not, if you don't have the link, you cannot quite understand what is meant.

Brett Hyland 30:19

Yeah, it's almost overwhelming, but we were quite deliberate in trying to remove the really heavy technical content from the table and put it into notes, to try and keep the visual as clear as we could. I mean, others can judge how well we managed to do that.

NS **Neil Savery** 30:36

I think you've done a good job, Brett. But as I say, and I back up Ronaldo, if you don't have the notes available and if you're not directed to those notes, it's not going to make sense.

Brett Hyland 30:37

Yeah. Now we before we move on to our next item, are there any other aspects that people would like to discuss regarding, particularly the table, but that whole assessment assurance piece more generally, I mean now's the time to discuss it because the boom will, the boom will come down on that, you know, the time for wholesale change will have passed by the time Zach incorporates it into the webpage.

ZZ **Zachary Zeus** 31:28

Mainly what I'll be doing is saying how I fit what everybody here came up with into the normative documents and if there's anything I have questions about like my expectation is this mostly fits norm into the more normative document because these are intended to be how we do the assurance model. If I feel doesn't fit, then I'll bring that to this group and I'll try and highlight how I met the intent of the document in the normative ages.

Brett Hyland 31:56

Can I just add on that particular topic, we added colour coding, orange and green with the idea of, you know, orange is caution, green's fine. But I mean, strictly speaking, that's not our role. You know, it's the colour coding is not actually necessary. The point is that the reader needs to understand whether the assurance is coming from the scheme, which we've coded orange or from an authority which we've coded green. But if it was felt that the colour coding was discriminatory, you know, I think I could understand that. It was seen as a bit of a tool to help the reader to navigate the pathways.

GR **Gideon Richards** 32:43

Yeah, mine's just a real quick one and I'm thinking more broadly in terms of product. So I'm thinking from environmental social governance, from sustainability in terms of the assurance side of it. I know we've got our SSA 5000 in the scheme governance examples, just wondering if there's anything else we need to think about from the accounting side on that as requirements because they seem to be building up quite fast at the moment.

Brett Hyland 33:30

Reinaldo did some research on that and we captured his thoughts on the matter. I don't think Ronaldo's claiming to be an accounting expert, but I think he might have taken advice from someone else who was somewhat knowledgeable. So hopefully we're OK

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 33:45

It's there. Gideon is there. If you're talking about the IFRS standards, it is there as reference.

GR Gideon Richards 33:50

Yeah, I was thinking about the assurance part of it from the from the accounting world that's coming through, but I think ISSA 5000 probably does it.

EF ETTY Feller 34:15

I thought that colors, following what you just said, we have to think that people that will use this information, probably not all of them will have the option to see it in colors. So maybe we have to think about other way like numbering or something like this for these three colors. Thank you.

ZZ Zachary Zeus 34:47

Yeah, I think we might use grayscale just to just highlight differences so that they they're differentiated, but we're not, we're not providing any kind of subjective or assessment then I think addresses color blindness so that we're not people don't have different experience. So I intend to do grayscale at this point unless I have I hear strong objections from folks.

BH Brett Hyland 35:23

Yep, I think. Well, I'm with that. All right. No, no other hands. Now something that came up at fairly short notice was a note from which I think you all received from Steve Capell, which is his attempts to use our scheme vocabulary Logical model to build real life scheme vocabularies for some participating schemes and he encountered some challenges. I don't think our group need take too much blame because we didn't actually change the logical model at all that we just we just put some explanation around it. But we probably now have to roll the sleeves up and have a good look at that logical model, in response to the things that Steve was talking about. And I thought maybe, the best way might be to reactivate what used to be our subgroup on scheme vocab. For those of you who may have participated now, I'm just trying to remember, I think Ulas was part of that, Jeff Ruddle, Gideon was there. Zach and Steve, I think might have participated as well. Adriana might have come in at some point. So I'm just suggesting that we reactivate that subgroup to go away and work in a less formal way on rejigging the digital structure of the

scheme vocabulary to satisfy Steve's concerns. I mean it'll use up hours and hours and hours of meeting time and I don't think that's right for the main group. Is there any concern over that approach and if we do go down that path, is there anyone else who would like to join the subgroup who wasn't part of the original subgroup.

NS Neil Savery 37:16

Brett, can I just clarify this is UNTP issue 590 that you sent out today?

BH Brett Hyland 37:22

Yes, sorry, #590. Yes, I sent a copy of it as a Word document today. It's quite a wide-ranging set of issues. One of them was obvious, which we we've known all along is that the scheme has to have provision for saying which scheme evaluation pathway was used, whether it's a self declaration, or benchmarking or government mandate. So that one was no surprise. But some of the other ones are a bit curlier so we're going to have to spend some time nutting it all out. It'll be detailed work but some of these challenges are good for exercising our grey matter. I'll send the invitation out to the usual suspects from the original subgroup and if anyone to decline that's fine too.

ZZ Zachary Zeus 38:22

Yakut, can I volunteer you to participate? Because these were discovered in exploring schemes that you are the most intimately familiar with among every anybody on the call. So it may be valuable to have your insight as we're going through this process.

BH Brett Hyland 38:44

Yep. Oh, I see that's a yes. OK, you're in.

S1 Speaker 1 38:44

Sure. Yep. Happy to join. Yeah.

GR Gideon Richards 38:49

And Mr. Ruddle might not be around because I think he's retired now.

BH Brett Hyland 38:55

Oh, no way. Ah, good on him. Oh, we'll miss him.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 39:08

If it's before July 1st, I'm in, but it's after you find me in a very different place.

Brett Hyland 39:22

Too many retirements.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 39:32

We did our contribution, now leave to the young people to do it.

Brett Hyland 39:35

That's fair enough. Now the next item is I think quite an interesting one and it is digital identity anchors Am I sharing?

ZZ **Zachary Zeus** 40:10

Yeah.

Brett Hyland 40:10

So digital identity anchors are a fairly new structure that came into UNTP off the back of a different UNCEFACT project, not UNTP, but the global registry of...what is it, Zach?

ZZ **Zachary Zeus** 40:42

The Grid project, Global Registry of Identity. I'll put a link in chat.

Brett Hyland 41:06

OK. So we're not involved in that particular project, it's a whole separate structure at the UN, but it's about verifying the identity of someone who's doing something. And the digital identity anchor is a particular tool within that project that's used to for an authority to grant some credential or approval or recognition to another party. And of course, you'll immediately think, that's what we're talking about with our assessment assurance, isn't it? Because we've got all these authorities that are involved that are conferring approvals or recognitions to other parties and we want to make sure that's done in a verifiable, cryptographically secure, auditable, publicly visible manner. You can see this is the schematic, so there's a trusted authority who

will give some approval. The recipient entity too has an ID that's anchored back to to the authority's identity. So it can't go drifting anywhere, it's cryptographically fixed. And if there's a particular role or some particular type of approval that's been given that that can be captured in the scope part of the structure. So I think you'll immediately see this is a very relevant concept for our work. Here is an example of how it works. Actually it's a bad example for our group but the idea here is that you scan a product barcode that calls up a digital product passport. You may want to know who issued it, the manufacturer for example. And so if you click on that identity that can take you back to a digital identity anchor. What that means is that this authority is recognising who this identity is and giving assurance that that the manufacturer really is who they say they are. You can't fudge it or fake it. As I say, it's a bad example because we have no interest in digital product passports. But we have interest in conformity credentials, which are a linked entity from a digital product passport. The exact principle applies though, you should be able to reach a conformity credential by scanning a barcode and then you may want to know who issued the conformity credential? How can we be sure that it was the same certification body that says they're issuing it? And then you may want to know who's attested to the competence of the certification body? So you may have an accreditation body or some a scheme benchmarking organisation. So you can go right back and nail things down quite tightly in that way. So one of our immediate challenges will be to revisit the logical model for the conformity credential and while we're at it, the logical model for the scheme vocabulary and make sure that we're properly building in the capacity for the digital identity anchors to do their job because that that is now seen as a core functionality within UNTP.

GR **Gideon Richards** 45:29

My question, it's back to definitions and terminology, who is an authority who sets that a flag of an authority as opposed to someone else or is it self-declared authority as in a government or what? I don't know where that comes from really.

Brett Hyland 46:06

By the way, there's an excellent chat going on. Roberto's asking all the right questions and getting good answers from Zach.

ZZ Zachary Zeus 46:29

Yeah, well, so that's the idea of the grid project. It basically becomes a registrar that kind of links the idea of nation states to the identity anchors in those nation states. And so whether or not you trust a identity anchor from a nation-state is again up to you. But trusting that it came from a nation-state actually does give you some information as opposed to something that may be just arbitrarily issued by anybody. And so it is not a perfect solution to sort of this trust question, but it is an anchor where you have an ability to make an assessment about the reliability of it or not. The underlying structure comes from how passports are run in that when we have a digital passport, like when we get to an airline gate, some passports can go through an E gate process. And that has to do with the rigor of the issuing process and the all sorts of other things that are going on behind the scenes that none of us will ever see. And some of them will not let you go through an E-gate process. And that has to do with the relative countries willingness to accept other countries passports. And so the same idea is being applied here, but for a much wider range of identifiers and so that we can apply that same sort of structure to product passports and facility records and conformity credentials. Is that helpful?

GR Gideon Richards 48:13

It is, but also knowing what you're saying, it's also political in some respects. So because you know some countries don't like other countries and some don't trust other countries etcetera, etcetera. Where does the criteria come from in terms of these? Like are we saying that all the identity, all the authority identifiers are country level? And if that's the case, then there's 193 of them and they're just, you know, recognised as those. And then further down the chain you decide whether you want to accept someone else's or not. Or is this something different?

ZZ Zachary Zeus 49:04

So basically it's the 193 nations would nominate their identifier schemes and describe them to the grid protocol so that it is discoverable by supply chain actors. The trustworthiness of an identity anchor from one country compared to another country is something that is up to the verifier, up to the recipient of the product passport. And so we're not going to take any value judgment on this country or that country.

There are just criteria, technical criteria. I register them, they're following the protocol, those types of things, they're supporting transparency. But as long as they meet that threshold, they'll be listed. And this goes to things like algorithmic due diligence at the border for customs clearing processing, right. And so the identity anchors like the trust of other people's identity anchors, other countries identity anchors will probably get very political in those kinds of negotiations and discussions and unilateral and multilateral agreements. But the technology needs to be abstract and the protocol needs to be abstracted all the way away from that process like and it'll be up to how people implement the algorithm validation as opposed to what's in the grid or not.

GR Gideon Richards 50:55

Can I can I just pick up, reading the chat notes as well and Ulas has said you know helpful, helpful Zach, but sounds impossible. Thinking about Ulas's organisation as in Philips, which is a global organisation, where would would the actual issuer, would that come from Holland or from someone you know because the multinational multinational companies go across the boundaries. Where does it start?

ZZ Zachary Zeus 51:42

It's a good question. And our view on this is that it starts with the identifiers that businesses and organizations are using today and we want over time to increase the verifiability of the information that is attached to these digital elements that are coming through the value chain. And so if I get a product passport, if Philips gets a product passport from a battery manufacturer as an example, and that battery passport has a digital product passport with several conformity credentials and a facility record attached to it and let's say the manufacturer was in a European state and that European state had not implemented digital identity anchors. They hadn't done anything. Then the verification process of reading that digital product passport is similar to the verification process of receiving products today. Like we just have it in a digital format that is a little bit easier to read, a little bit easier to consume. Now, as folks adopt these sort of trust anchors, then we can start doing algorithmic due diligence on the sets of claims that are being made, and that evolves over time into something that is increasingly valuable, increasingly verifiable. And hopefully increasingly trustworthy in in trade. But that is up to Phillips to assess, as the buyer of the battery with the passport.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 53:30

Yeah, I have two questions. The first question is who is responsible to submit the data? If I'm a organization in the country X, I need to go to my government to submit my information or I can go straight to UNTP to put my information there.

ZZ **Zachary Zeus** 53:57

I think that's an open question, but my very strong vote on that would be both. But we would what would happen is that if you do go through your government, you get your government's identity anchor on top of your identity anchor.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 54:12

OK, now I got it. The second question, if in the future new identifier needs to be created, what is the process?

ZZ **Zachary Zeus** 54:20

Register like just the same process as like it's register an identifier and follow the protocol.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 54:38

For instance, that picture is like that Brett sent. There are some identifiers there, OK? And then maybe in the future with all digital whatever, there is a need to create a new ID there and then need to follow UNTP process to create that ID. Is that correct?

 **Brett Hyland** 55:07

So I'm about to discover this in in in real life because this month my own organization decided to see if we could get a digital identity anchor up ourselves. And of course we want to follow the UNTP because you know, I'm personally so invested in that. So we would be using my government's business number.

FR **Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 55:30

No, but look, my question was not to respond. I like to see, I like to get or say I cannot respond. OK, I saw the IDs there, five or six IDs and then it's going to be created because there is a need to create a new ID for some process. What is the process to create that new ID there?

Zachary Zeus 56:05

ZZ I think we can take that question on notice. I I think, yeah.

NU **Nalbantoglu, Ulas** 56:13

Thank you. So actually I I agree with Gideon and I want to just compliment some. Questions. First of all, will this process be voluntary? As far as I understand, when I first raised my hand, I thought that it would be something that we will seek from all the passport appliers. But then I think it will be voluntary, right? That will be my first. Question. Is that correct, Zach?

ZZ **Zachary Zeus** 56:52

Anything that UNCEFACT does is a voluntary standard. There's no ability, no, no mechanism for enforcement of any kind of mandatory requirements in this ecosystem. So there's no framework for it to be anything other than voluntary.

NU **Nalbantoglu, Ulas** 56:53

OK.

Yeah, you're right. Then I asked the wrong question since you might have a digital product passport on your product and you apply all the requirements from UNTP protocol. You may still do not have any identifier, or you may not still have any identity number produced by the authority, right? Because I'm asking this question because thinking all the nations and having all these authorities from each countries on board sounds impossible. That's the that's the thing that I want to actually explain a little bit further so and considering the laws apply also all these regular countries, we might face that some of them will not be available in terms of laws to be able even able to participate because there might be maybe some restrictions considering the local law and act or whatever. So when I said sounds impossible onboarding all these authorities into the scheme, it sounds a little bit unpractical, but ideally that's great. Of course, if you can achieve something like that, that would be great. But practically and de facto it is, it is not easy to reach which authority will it be and things like that. But yeah, I got, I got, I got my answer. Thank you.

ZZ **Zachary Zeus** 58:58

Well, Ulas, there's actually an important sort of piece there that I think bears unpacking for this group because we talk about it in other groups as well. The

adoption question is one of the big questions that we're going to wrestle with as a group and as a sort of standard-setter and I think Adriana's on here and she's very much on how we communicate about this. But adoption becomes goes beyond just the communication side of this and it goes to what are the benefits and incentives for adoption and how do we make it as easy and as fast as possible for organizations that want to adopt to successfully adopt. Those are the kinds of things that we're working on in a number of different domains and areas, but to the point about identifiers, it may not have been clear is that any identifier, even if it's not registered, even if it doesn't have an identity anchor, even if it's not UNTP compliant, can be used in a product passport or a facility record or a conformity credential and that can be used by the recipient of the product passport for their own due diligence purposes and so you don't have to have all of the apparatus in place for there to be value. We want to architect the protocol so that as much value can be realized, as adoption occurs. And so that's kind of the balance we're striking. So a lot of these conversations that we're having, down in the details are about value that emerges as adoption occurs.

NU Nalbantoglu, Ulas 1:00:49

So this is just to complement additional trust for the ultimate level of trust, how far the NTP program can go in terms of trust. So that's OK. So thank you for the clarification. Thank you.

Brett Hyland 1:01:04

I think that's very much the case because I was told that any of us can anchor our identity to our national tax office business number because that is that's a publicly available register. It may not have been blessed by the UN, but it's pretty trustworthy thing as it stands, to anchor my organisation's identity.

NS Neil Savery 1:01:35

I was just going to make the observation, Brett, that I acknowledge and accept what Zach said, that the UNTP itself, you know, isn't something that can be regulated by the UN or that anything we're doing. But governments have had a habit of introducing their regulations in a way that might cause people to gravitate towards something that is available that enables them to deliver the outcome they want to achieve. So if this infrastructure ends up being in place and existing with digital

identifiers, etcetera, governments may structure their regulation in such a way that almost embeds this type of arrangement. So not something the UNTP has done, but it's enabled a government to do and Gideon, you may disagree with me, but just to try and think of an analogy with ESG legislation expanding around the world and the use of the accounting standards, you know those two things have come together and it's the governments that are regulating through their ESG legislation, creating lots of new authorities and new reporting requirements, etc. And there's an accounting standard that now exists that becomes the bedrock to enable that ESG reporting to be done and done in almost a universal way.

Brett Hyland 1:03:14

We do need to wrap up and I did want to show another slide, but Reinaldo and then Gideon can make it make a quick comment.

FR Figueiredo, Reinaldo 1:03:20

Quick, very quick. Just Zach, if this like this identifier can be very helpful for all the organizations that are involved in conformity assessment and also the beneficiaries and who are like get. Take certificates or declarations, because today it's a kind of a mess and this is gaining more and more importance. And then this can drive other organizations to use your identifier, you know what I mean to have a place there to at least to check what is the credibility this exists, just to let you know.

ZZ Zachary Zeus 1:04:06

Yeah, thanks.

GR Gideon Richards 1:04:08

Yeah, I get that. I I just wonder, I still wonder if the lowest common denominators will fit into this and you'll go to where you can feel most comfortable at the level you want in terms of getting your identifier linked to what you're doing. Neil, I agree with you. It seems to be coming together in terms of the ESG side to actually get some authoritative sort of routes through. But then there's lots of nuances and tweaks to it. But when you're saying all of that, it made me think of in conformity assessment, we have something called the imperative mood and that is that if you write something in a particular way, then it's sort of leading someone without it actually being a shall.

 **Zachary Zeus** 1:05:04

So it's a should with an imperative mood. OK, I'll work on that when working on our normative documents.

 **Brett Hyland** 1:05:10

So, just to bring this conversation to a close, whilst we can we can talk about the grand scheme of everything, within our particular group we are interested in things like who gives the identity to a conformity assessment body, where does an accreditation body get their identity as being part of the global mutual recognition arrangement? And I'll just show you one other application for this digital identity anchor. So this, this is the UNIDO document and we're hoping that a mechanism will emerge, that a body, hopefully UNIDO can approve benchmarking organisations against this standard. And so that will be another use case for the digital identity anchor leading up to an ultimate global issue of trust.

So those are some of the interesting use cases that we will be concentrating on in our group. But in any case, thank you very much for your attention today and I hope that you found some interest and I look forward to seeing you again at the next session. And in the meantime, if you want to be part of the subgroup dealing with scheme vocabulary, I shall see you there as well. Thank you again.

□ **Brett Hyland** stopped transcription