

Aug 6, 2026

# UNTP Technical WG

Invited [bvanderpol@usetappr.com](mailto:bvanderpol@usetappr.com) [markus@danubetech.com](mailto:markus@danubetech.com)  
[christian.orlowski@4therecord.io](mailto:christian.orlowski@4therecord.io) [just@4therecord.io](mailto:just@4therecord.io) [nick@cordina.io](mailto:nick@cordina.io)  
[phil.archer@gs1.org](mailto:phil.archer@gs1.org) ~~[jo@sezoo.digital](mailto:jo@sezoo.digital)~~

Attachments  UNTP Technical WG  Notes - UNTP Technical WG

## Summary

The meeting prioritized reviewing technical pull requests and debating documentation standards for the United Nations Traceability Protocol.

### Pull Request Reviews

The team accepted multiple updates regarding documentation clarity, including removing redundant JavaScript Object Notation examples and standardizing terminology for United Nations Traceability Protocol references. A decision was made to merge updates broadening facility identifier examples to ensure inclusivity.

### Documentation Standards Discussion

Participants debated the distinction between product passport and digital product passport terminology without reaching a final resolution. Concerns regarding Unified Modeling Language notation clarity were acknowledged, leading to an agreement to integrate diagram legends.

### Governance and Architecture

Attendees expressed concerns regarding the transparency of decision-making processes within steering committees. The group also evaluated a new proposed architecture for validating traceability graphs via an intermediary structure.

# Decisions

## Needs Further Discussion

- **Terminology change request deferred** A proposal to change documentation terminology from 'Digital Product Passport' to 'Product Passport' for non-technical business contexts was discussed but not finalized, pending further consultation with external working groups.

## Aligned

- **Consistent implementation language defined** The UNTP implementation language is standardized from 'may' to 'should' to ensure consistency throughout the specification.
- **Duplicate JSON examples removed** Redundant JSON code blocks are removed from the documentation to improve reader clarity and reduce confusion.
- **Facility identifier example included** The identity resolver documentation is updated to include examples focused on facilities in addition to product-focused examples.
- **Legacy terminology removed** The term 'legacy' is removed from all documentation regarding data carriers to avoid pejorative language.
- **Ontology update deferred** Updates to specific ontology objects are deferred in favor of a planned transition to the vocab.org ontology.
- **UML notation clarification merged** Clarifying text regarding the use of UML notation in the specification's logical model diagrams is accepted for inclusion.

We've **updated the Decisions section** using your feedback.

Let us know what you think: [Helpful](#) or [Not Helpful](#)

## Next steps

- ☐ [Harley Thomas] Notify Contributors: Contact all individuals who submitted issues regarding the status of their respective pull requests.
- ☐ [Harley Thomas] Migrate Ontology: Collaborate with Steve to replace the current UNTP ontology with vocab.org.
- ☐ [Harley Thomas] Update Terminology: Remove the term legacy from data carrier definitions to resolve the Bosch issue.
- ☐ [Harley Thomas] Merge Facility PR: Process the pull request from Irin regarding the facility identifier examples.
- ☐ [Harley Thomas] Resolve UML Conflicts: Fix conflicts within the pull request regarding UML notation and diagrams.
- ☐ [Phil Archer] Review Pending Items: Schedule time to review outstanding topics discussed during the meeting.
- ☐ [Albert Verdeny] Review Pull Request: Review the pull request and provide feedback on the proposed architecture for expressing rules in a human readable way.
- ☐ [Albert Verdeny] Evaluate Architecture: Examine the pull request changes to determine if they address existing concerns regarding the proposed approach.
- ☐ [Harley Thomas] Organize Meeting: Organize a meeting to address the ticket mentioned by Susan K on the Slack channel.

## Details

- **Meeting Logistics and Time Constraints:** The meeting began with general pleasantries, after which the participants noted that Phil Archer had only 30 minutes available, necessitating an efficient review of the agenda. Harley Thomas proposed focusing on a series of pull requests to facilitate progress toward a version 1 release by September, followed by a discussion on graph validation.
- **Pull Request Review - May versus Should:** Harley Thomas presented a pull request from Anish at Microsoft that addressed conflicting language regarding

the use of "may" and "should" in the implementation of the UNTP (United Nations Traceability Protocol). The change aimed to ensure consistency across the documentation, and with no objections raised and prior review by Steve, the change was approved.

- **Pull Request Review - JSON Example Consistency:** Harley Thomas discussed a pull request from Anish regarding confusion in the registered identity section. The issue involved the repetition of business use case examples, which forced readers to manually compare segments of JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) to determine if they were identical. The pull request proposed removing this redundancy, and it was accepted.
- **Pull Request Review - RFC 2119 Reference:** The group addressed an issue raised by Anish regarding the specification's requirements keywords. To clarify the references to "may," "should," and "must," Harley Thomas proposed adding a direct reference to the IETF Request for Comments 2119, a standard practice in technical documentation.
- **Discussion on Digital Product Passport Terminology:** Harley Thomas introduced a draft pull request from Brett Highland, who proposed separating business and technical language by using "product passport" for business contexts and "digital product passport" (DPP) for technical ones. The group debated this; while Phil Archer and Adrienna Zsakay expressed skepticism about the terminology shift and the potential impact on regulatory language, they acknowledged that it was an ongoing point of contention. Ultimately, Harley Thomas decided to leave the pull request in draft status for further consideration.
- **Discussion on Naming Conventions and Object Wrappers:** Albert Verdeny raised concerns regarding the terminology used for various objects in the specification, questioning whether they should be labeled as "traceability events" if they function as wrappers for other events rather than events themselves. The conversation highlighted the tension between technical and non-technical language, with Adrienna Zsakay noting that having disparate naming systems could be problematic.
- **Pull Request Review - Facility Identifier Examples:** Harley Thomas presented a pull request from Irin, a technical lead at the Open Supply Hub, which suggested broadening the specification's examples to include facility identifiers rather than focusing exclusively on product identifiers. This change was

supported by Phil Archer, and Harley Thomas committed to merging the request.

- **Pull Request Review - GS1 Example Bias:** The group reviewed a pull request from Anish concerning the over-reliance on GS1 examples within the documentation. Both Phil Archer and Harley Thomas agreed that the examples should be inclusive and avoid potential conflicts or biases, leading to a decision to resolve the issue.
- **Pull Request Review - Legacy Data Carriers:** Harley Thomas proposed removing mentions of "legacy" data carriers, noting that the term is often perceived as pejorative. Phil Archer concurred with the removal, and the group agreed to proceed with updating the language.
- **Pull Request Review - Verifiable Auditability:** Harley Thomas presented an issue from Anish regarding the distinction between signature-based authenticity and verifiable auditability. There was a discussion on whether a verifiable credential provides integrity independently or requires additional transparency mechanisms. Because of the complexity and potential for conflating these concepts, Harley Thomas decided not to merge this pull request, citing a need for further review.
- **Pull Request Review - Ontology Fixes:** Harley Thomas identified an error in the ontology where an object and statement were incorrectly typed as a string instead of an Internationalized Resource Identifier (IRI). Harley Thomas deferred the fix, noting that the entire UNTP ontology would eventually be replaced by the vocab.org standard.
- **Pull Request Review - UML Notation Specification:** Harley Thomas proposed adding clear documentation to the front page of the specification to state that Unified Modeling Language (UML) notation is used. The participants agreed to this, and Harley Thomas moved to merge the change.
- **Pull Request Review - Diagram Legend and Notation:** Albert Verdeny highlighted that the current documentation lacks a legend explaining the notation used in UML diagrams, which leads to confusion regarding elements like bold text or stars. While the group discussed this, Harley Thomas noted that the issue could be addressed alongside the previously discussed UML notation updates.

- **Discussion on Traceability Events and Electronic Product Code Information Services:** Albert Verdeny questioned the current approach to "Make Move Modify" traceability events, arguing that they are too simplistic and insufficient for supply chain needs. Albert Verdeny suggested adopting Electronic Product Code Information Services (EPCIS) as the standard, emphasizing that it does not require exclusive use of GS1 identifiers. Harley Thomas acknowledged the simplicity of the current model for encouraging adoption but agreed with Albert Verdeny's concerns about the potential for redundant and confusing event definitions.
- **Discussion on Organizational Governance and Decision-Making:** Adrienna Zsakay and Albert Verdeny expressed frustration regarding the lack of transparency in how decisions are made within the working groups and the steering committee. Adrienna Zsakay noted that significant work contributions often result in no feedback or clarity on decision-making processes. Harley Thomas clarified that, while they could not speak for other working groups, they were committed to technical collaboration and open discussion.
- **Discussion on Graph Validation Architecture:** Harley Thomas outlined a proposed architecture for validating the traceability graph, which involves creating a human-readable rule set that translates into an intermediary JSON structure and subsequently into Shackle or Cipher targets. Albert Verdeny agreed to review the draft pull request containing these changes to see if they addressed their concerns.
- **Future Meeting Planning:** Albert Verdeny raised a request from Susan K. regarding the need for a dedicated meeting to discuss ticket 705. Harley Thomas agreed to organize this meeting in the future to ensure the topic receives appropriate attention.

*You should review Gemini's notes to make sure they're accurate. [Get tips and learn how Gemini takes notes](#)*

*How is the quality of **these specific notes**? [Take a short survey](#) to let us know your feedback, including how helpful the notes were for your needs.*