


RE: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

From Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>

Date Thu 4/10/2025 3:16 PM

To Shabatura, Daryna <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@ivl.se>; Prithivesh Ashok <Prithivesh.Ashok@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Tania Bethoon <Tania.Bethoon@environdec.com>

Cc Berednikov, Alexandr <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Karpenko, Yuliia <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Stepanyuk, Yana <yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>

Hello again,

I spoke to Ayse and she confirmed the info text, also I highlighted the preferred option! Thanks 😊

Kind regards,

	Danielle Crowter Elfving Market & Support Specialist Email: danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com Stay connected on LinkedIn and newsletter	 INTERNATIONAL EPD SYSTEM EPD International AB Proud inventors of the PCR and EPD
---	--	---

From: Daryna Shabatura <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>

Sent: den 9 april 2025 17:35

To: Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@ivl.se>; Prithivesh Ashok <Prithivesh.Ashok@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Tania Bethoon <Tania.Bethoon@environdec.com>

Cc: Alexandr Berednikov <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Yuliia Karpenko <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Yana Stepanyuk <yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>

Subject: Re: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hi Danielle,

Thanks for your confirmation.

1. To elaborate on the first point, this change addresses a currently confusing situation. At the moment, a warning message always appears in old wizard when the previous verifier is discontinued, even if the user is only making an editorial update. This can be misleading, as it implies that the user has made an error and needs to take action - when in fact, no action is required, since editorial updates do not need EPD verification.

VERIFIER ⓘ ⓘ

X
Find more

If in need of verification request, kindly contact other verifiers in the International EPD System, as the current verifier is no longer listed.

To resolve this, we plan to replace the warning with a general informational message that will always be shown when a discontinued verifier is selected. This way, the message will be appropriate and understandable whether the update is editorial or not. It will simply provide informational context.

The wording we propose is:

"For major updates requiring EPD verification, please select an active verifier. For editorial updates, the verifier from the previous EPD version should be retained."

We're open to suggestions if you have alternative wording.

2. For another part of [this user story](#), we simply want to avoid situations where a discontinued verifier is accidentally removed, making it impossible to reselect them for an editorial update. To prevent this, we suggest adding a confirmation pop-up when the user first interacts with the Verifier dropdown:

Please select better wording from these options:

- Are you sure you want to remove this selection? Once deleted, it cannot be restored, as it is no longer relevant.
- Are you sure you want to remove this selection? This action is irreversible.
- Once removed, this selection cannot be restored. Do you want to proceed?
- Are you sure you want to remove this selection? Once removed, this option will no longer be available.

Let me know if a quick meeting would be helpful to go over this. Thanks!

Daryna Shabatura | Business Analyst



<https://sigma.software>

From: Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 9, 2025 3:20 PM
To: Shabatura, Daryna <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@jvl.se>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@jvl.se>; Prithivesh Ashok <Prithivesh.Ashok@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@jvl.se>; Tania Bethoon <Tania.Bethoon@environdec.com>
Cc: Berednikov, Alexandr <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Karpenko, Yuliia <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Stepanyuk, Yana <Yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>
Subject: RE: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Thank you!! Please see my comments below. I think all looks good, but maybe you need to confirm that I understood the solutions correctly 😊

1. Good that you noticed this detail as well – I think I did not even think about this specific case. But I am not completely sure that I understood fully: Do the different messages show up depending on what they try to do? Perhaps the message should communicate the following message: “Please note that if you change the verifier now then you must start a new verification. If you are only making an editorial update the verifier should not be changed.” But I think I want Compliance input on what kind of message they want to give. [@Ayse Nur Ozturk](#) [@Tania Bethoon](#) what do you think? Let me know if you need help understanding it .
2. This one is clear and sounds good! Adding the mandatory indicator at this stage also makes sense.
3. All clear and sounds good.

Kind regards,

Danielle Crowter Elfving
 Market & Support Specialist
 Email: danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com
 Stay connected on [LinkedIn](#) and [newsletter](#)

From: Daryna Shabaturo <daryna.shabaturo@sigma.software>
Sent: den 7 april 2025 16:48
To: Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>; danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse-nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@ivl.se>; Prithivesh Ashok <Prithivesh.Ashok@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>
Cc: Alexandr Berednikov <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Yuliia Karpenko <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Yana Stepanyuk <yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>
Subject: Re: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hi [@Danielle Crowter Elfving](#) [@Ariadna Serra Garra](#),

I've outlined a potential solution and documented it in the related user stories. Please take a moment to review and share your feedback. You can focus just on the proposed solution section, as the rest contains background information for context.

Old wizard scope:

1. [Old wizard > Update Verifier field behavior](#) - a **confirmation pop-up**, when a user starts any interaction with Verifier dropdown + change the **current warning message** to informative message, that will always be displayed
2. [Old wizard > Enhance Verifier Issue Visibility](#) - a **pop-up message**, when the user clicks "Start verification" with an inactive verifier (the last message that you suggested).

I understand your concern about this, but maybe we can explain 2 possible options better. We can either use your wording (shorter), or this one: *"You are about to send the EPD for verification, however, the verifier you have selected is not available. Please select an active verifier from the list. If you are making an editorial update that does not require verification, please describe the change and send the EPD for publication."*

EPD Compiler scope:

3. [EPD Compiler > Update Verifier field behavior](#) - locking the verifier field (editorial update)/ showing warning message in case of the inactive verifier (major update with verification)

Please let me know if you agree with this approach, and feel free to suggest another text or modify the current wordings. Thank you,

Daryna Shabatura | Business Analyst



<https://sigma.software>

From: Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 2, 2025 4:35 PM
To: Shabatura, Daryna <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@ivl.se>; Prithivesh Ashok <Prithivesh.Ashok@environdec.com>
Cc: Berednikov, Alexandr <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Karpenko, Yuliia <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Stepanyuk, Yana <yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>
Subject: Re: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hey all,

Prith and Ayse had a meeting yesterday and agreed to adjust the requirement slightly.

For the pop-up:

If they attempt to start verification, the message should be:

"You are about to send the EPD to verification, however, the verifier you have selected is not available. Please select an active verifier from the list."

We should exclude this part:

"or if you are only making an editorial update that does not require verification from a verifier, please use the editorial update function."

The reason for this change is that we don't want to mislead or push them toward submitting an editorial update.



Ariadna Serra

Market & Finance Specialist

Email: ariadna.serra.garra@environdec.com

Stay connected on [LinkedIn](#) and [newsletter](#)



[EPD International AB](#)

Proud inventors of the PCR and EPD

[Book time to meet with me](#)

From: Daryna Shabatura <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>

Sent: 01 April 2025 18:03

To: Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>; danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se <danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@ivl.se>

Cc: Alexandr Berednikov <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Yuliia Karpenko <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Yana Stepanyuk <yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>

Subject: Re: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hi Danielle,

Thank you! We had internal discussions with the team to determine the best solution. I've prepared user stories for this update in old wizard, but we first need to finalize the message wording and resolve some design concerns. I'll get back to you early next week with the finalized requirements for your approval, as I'll be on vacation this week.

Thank you,

Daryna Shabatura | Business Analyst



<https://sigma.software>

From: Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 12:24 PM

To: Shabatura, Daryna <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@ivl.se>

Cc: Berednikov, Alexandr <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Karpenko, Yuliia <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Stepanyuk, Yana <yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>

Subject: RE: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hello Daryna,

We have discussed this in the support team and agreed on the below solution for verifiers that do not have a contract any more for old wizard.

No pop-up or info beforehand, but:

- if they choose editorial update they can simply proceed,
- if they attempt to start verification then we have a pop-up that says something like:
"You are about to send the EPD to verification however the verifier you have selected is not available. Please select an active verifier in the list, or if you are only making an editorial update that does not require verification from a verifier please use the editorial update function."

Also a question – did we decide anything about changing the red info text under the verifier or did we decide to keep that as it is? 😊

Kind regards,



Danielle Crowter Elfving
Support Specialist

Email: danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com
Stay connected on [LinkedIn](#) and [newsletter](#)



EPD International AB
Proud inventors of the PCR and EPD

From: Daryna Shabatura <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>

Sent: den 26 mars 2025 15:40

To: danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@ivl.se>

Cc: Alexandr Berednikov <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Yuliia Karpenko <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Yana Stepanyuk <yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>

Subject: Re: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hi Danielle,

Yes, please let me know, once you have any updates after the internal discussion.
Thanks!

Daryna Shabatura | Business Analyst



<https://sigma.software>

From: Danielle Crowter Elfving <Danielle.Crowter.Elfving@ivl.se>

Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2025 3:04 PM

To: Shabatura, Daryna <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@ivl.se>

Cc: Berednikov, Alexandr <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Karpenko, Yuliia <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Stepanyuk, Yana <yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>

Subject: RE: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hello Daryna,

Thanks for reaching out about this! I added some comments below.

For a solution for old wizard, can you wait until Monday for my response? Then I can bring this up with the group for discussion so we are all aligned in proposed solution. Perhaps we need to have the extra step after they submit update instead, i.e. if they choose editorial update they can simply proceed, if they attempt to start verification then we have a pop-up that says something like:

"You are about to send the EPD to verification however the verifier you have selected is not available. Please select an active verifier in the list, or if you are only making an editorial update that does not require verification from a verifier please use the editorial update function."

I will propose this solution to our group and give you the thumbs up, or another proposal depending on their feedback. 😊

Kind regards,

Danielle Crowter Elfving

Administratör

IVL Svenska Miljöinstitutet

Telefon: +46 (0)76-518 53 52

E-post: danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se

Postadress: Box 210 60, 100 31 Stockholm | Besöksadress: Valhallavägen 81, Stockholm

www.ivl.se

From: Daryna Shabatura <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>

Sent: den 25 mars 2025 18:06

To: danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <Ayse.Nur.Ozturk@ivl.se>; Danielle Crowter Elfving <Danielle.Crowter.Elfving@ivl.se>

Cc: Berednikov, Alexandr <alexandr.berednikov@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Karpenko, Yuliia <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>; Stepanyuk, Yana <yana.stepanyuk@sigma.software>

Subject: Re: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hi Danielle,

I'm writing to clarify the solution for discontinued verifiers shown on the EPD.

Currently, the system always copies the verifier name from the previous version to the next version, it does not depend on if it's an editorial update or no. According to this, do we understand the expected flow correctly:

1. Editorial update - verifier name is copied from the previous version (autofilled, even if it's a discontinued verifier), no warning message is shown, as no actions are needed in this case (maybe we can lock this field then?) Correct – And I really like the idea about locking the field!! Makes complete sense.

2. Major update - verifier name is copied from the previous version (autofilled, even if it's a discontinued verifier), but there is a warning message (current solution) that informs the user that a new verifier must be selected. Correct!

VERIFIER ⓘ ⓘ

If in need of verification request, kindly contact other verifiers in the International EPD System, as the current verifier is no longer listed.

If this is correct, then we need to define how it should work in old wizard. As currently, only in EPD Compiler it's possible to clearly define the type of update before creating a new version:

Update EPD

This EPD was approved by the verifier.

You are allowed to make only the editorial changes to the verified EPD, such as correction of spelling errors without verification.

If the EPD information needs an update, either the product or LCA, you shall verify the EPD again.

☒

The EPD needs a verification, I will update the EPD information.

☐

The EPD verification is not needed, I will make the editorial update.

Cancel

Submit

In old wizard, we can't define it before the update, as we don't have a pop-up like this. So the new version is created automatically and then it's validated with the buttons (final step), that means that we don't know what should be the flow for the EPD Owners when they fill in the information before they send it for verification or just publication.

EPD-IES-0006846:001 Test States 51 - Updating

Start verification

Send to publish

In case of only editorial changes ? ⓘ

Please give a short description of the editorial changes before registering the EPD update.

So could you please help us with defining the best option for old wizard?

We can either validate it on the last step (when they click "start verification", the EPD can't have the discontinued verifier selected, and if it's just "sent to publish" with editorial comment, then it's ok) but this validation will be more complex to implement, or maybe we can add another message for them to inform that if it's an editorial update, they should not change the verifier, and select another one only if it's a major update with verification.

In Compiler we can lock this field in case of the editorial update, but in old wizard there is a problem that we can't lock it and the user can remove the discontinued verifier and will not be able to select him again.

Please let me know what you think, or we can have a short call, if needed.
Thanks!

Daryna Shabatura | Business Analyst



<https://sigma.software>

From: Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2025 5:17 PM
To: Shabatura, Daryna <daryna.shabatura@sigma.software>; Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; ayse.nur.ozturk@ivl.se <ayse.nur.ozturk@ivl.se>; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se>
Cc: Berednikov, Alexandr <Alexandr.Berednikov@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Karpenko, Yulia <yulia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>
Subject: RE: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hey Daryna!

Thanks for reaching out about this!

I also confirmed in the US and confirm both case 1 and 2 that you propose. I.e.:

1. Editorial update – previous verifier remains
2. Verified (major) update – new verifier must be selected (in this case it is good to show the red error message which explains that reason why they need to select a new verifier)

[@Ayse Nur Ozturk](#) I did not check with you but I guess you will agree. However feel free to give you approval of this and let me know If you need further explanation of what we are talking about!

Kind regards,



Danielle Crowter Elfving
Support Specialist

Email: danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com
Stay connected on [LinkedIn](#) and [newsletter](#)



EPD International AB
Proud inventors of the PCR and EPD

From: Daryna Shabatara <daryna.shabatara@sigma.software>

Sent: den 19 mars 2025 10:11

To: Ayse Nur Ozturk <ayse.nur.ozturk@environdec.com>; ayse.nur.ozturk@ivl.se; Danielle Crowter Elfving <danielle.crowter.elfving@environdec.com>; danielle.crowter.elfving@ivl.se

Cc: Alexandr Berednikov <Alexandr.Berednikov@sigma.software>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@environdec.com>; Ariadna Serra Garra <Ariadna.Serra.Garra@ivl.se>; Yuliia Karpenko <yuliia.karpenko@sigma.software>; Sofia Kubalski <sofia.kubalski@environdec.com>

Subject: Discontinued verifier shown on the EPD - Clarifications

Hi Ayse and Danielle,

I'm writing to clarify requirements for this related user story [US-9122](#).

We know that even if verifiers are discontinued, they should be shown on a particular EPD as verifiers, since the verification occurred before the contract termination, so they should be the visible verifiers in the EPDs.

So for this case described in the user story, the data has been restored and we have a question about the suggested future solution.

[@Danielle Crowter Elfving](#) mentioned:

Problem to be solved is: Even if a verifier is discontinued, i.e. verifier status removed - there status as a verifier of a certain version of an EPD must remain. The same version of the EPD should be able to be handled as usual and the visible verifier should be the one who verified it (even if he no longer has a contract).

Is that correct, that **we should keep this connection only to already verified EPDs**? What should happen to the **new version of such EPD** verified by a discontinued verifier?

- In case we have a new EPD version only with editorial update - should we keep this verifier, as such EPD does not require additional verification?
- If it's a new EPD version with major updates that require verification - then a discontinued verifier **should not** be listed and a new active verifier must be selected by EPD Owner?

In that particular user story, there were EPDs with only editorial updates, so we wanted to double check how it should work depending on the verification process needed.

Please let me know what you think on this matter. Thank you!

Best regards,

Daryna Shabatura | Business Analyst



<https://sigma.software>