

STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATION

P4

From a circa-2007 provenance vision to a focused asset-evidence platform

Prepared for: Joel Ward

For discussion with: [REDACTED]

Date: September 2, 2026

Status: Confidential discussion draft; strategic recommendation, not an offering memorandum

Requested analysis. This memorandum is an artificial-intelligence-assisted analysis requested by Joel Ward of the P4, WARDTRAC / Walking Wealth, and related proposals he developed circa 2007–2015 and supplied for review. It compares those historical concepts with the technologies, standards, organizations, and commercial conditions visible as of September 2026. Its purpose is to identify the part that should now be pursued and a disciplined way to test it; it is not an independent valuation, legal opinion, or investment offering.

Recommendation: Proceed, but pursue the strongest commercial core: the P4 Asset Evidence Passport for high-value movable personal property. Launch with luxury and collectible assets in estate, insurance, appraisal, collection-management, and transfer workflows. Fund it in gated stages, starting with a 90-day validation and concierge pilot rather than attempting the universal registry all at once.

Executive summary

The archival P4 and WARDTRAC materials support a clear conclusion: Joel Ward was not merely circling a fashionable idea. In 2007 he described several operating principles that now sit at the center of digital provenance systems—persistent asset identities, locked historical records, append-only corrections, separate ownership and intellectual-property rights, authorized transfers, selective privacy, evidence uploads, and challenge/counter-evidence. The modern vocabulary arrived later. The underlying judgment was already there.

The right 2026 company is not the entire original ecosystem. It is the evidence engine at its center. The recommended launch product, the P4 Asset Evidence Passport, would give owners and professionals a durable, private, shareable dossier for watches, jewelry, handbags, art, antiques, and other valuable collectibles. Each passport would show what has been claimed, what evidence supports it, who supplied or verified that evidence, what changed over time, and what remains disputed or uncertain.

Your interest in the luxury-goods registry is directionally right. Luxury assets are valuable, portable, often uninsured or poorly documented, frequently gifted or inherited, and regularly separated from receipts, certificates, service records, appraisals, and provenance. Existing offerings validate the demand, but they are fragmented by brand, category, marketplace, or single purpose. That fragmentation creates room for a cross-brand evidence and workflow layer—provided we do not claim to be the official authenticator or legal title authority for every object.

1. **Start with luxury movable assets**, not every type of property.
2. **Sell through trusted professionals**—estate planners, fiduciaries, appraisers, dealers, insurers, and collection managers—rather than relying only on consumer advertising.
3. **Make evidence quality and provenance visible**: self-asserted, document-supported, professional-attested, issuer-confirmed, or authoritative-source linked.
4. **Use ordinary secure software first**; add cryptographic receipts and optional public anchoring where they improve auditability. The customer should never need a token or crypto wallet.
5. **Treat the first investment as a series of decision gates**. The largest uncertainty is adoption and partner participation, not whether the software can be built.

1. The market caught up to P4

The strongest founder narrative is factual, not flattering: Joel was early, and he was right about the important architecture. P4 was conceived and documented in August and September 2007, before blockchain became a mainstream design vocabulary and before smartphones, inexpensive cloud storage, machine-readable credentials, and product-passport standards were mature enough to make the experience practical. The documents do not simply say “put art on the internet.” They work through governance, authority, rights, privacy, evidence, corrections, and disputes.

2007 design judgment	Modern validation	What it means now
Prior records lock; later changes append	Event-sourced systems and cryptographically verifiable transparency logs	Make the asset timeline a core product object, not a changeable profile.
Physical ownership is distinct from copyright, licenses, agency, and custody	Modern credentials and product passports separate issuers, holders, subjects, and claims	Model each right or role independently; never collapse them into one “owner” field.
Claims can be challenged; corrections remain visible	Multi-issuer attestations, audit receipts, and superseding statements	Preserve conflict and resolution history instead of silently overwriting it.
Owner identity and asset details can be selectively disclosed	Role-based access, privacy-preserving credentials, and controlled sharing	Keep the collection private by default and share only the evidence a recipient needs.
Registration must provide a practical benefit	Digital warranties, resale, insurance, service histories, and product passports	Lead with immediate utility; provenance grows as a by-product of repeated useful workflows.

Source basis: P4 Project Docs-Archive (August–September 2007) and Walking Wealth / WARDTRAC materials supplied by Joel Ward. The table is a modern strategic interpretation, not a claim that every individual component was legally novel.

The market's later development is the best corroboration. The IETF's 2026 SCITT architecture now describes signed statements, append-only transparency services, superseding statements, and independently verifiable receipts. W3C Verifiable Credentials formalize the issuer-holder-verifier model. GS1, Aura, Arianee, and brand programs are implementing digital product passports. Joel's original documents anticipated the systems problem these efforts are now solving.

The striking validation: Joel should say: “I identified the architecture early; the enabling standards and adoption channels have now caught up.” He should not claim that every present-day registry copied P4 or that the archival documents create an exclusive legal monopoly. The credible claim is stronger because it is narrower: the documents show unusually early, detailed, and durable product judgment.

2. The company we should build

P4 Asset Evidence Passport

Build a private, cross-brand evidence passport for valuable movable property. “Luxury” should be defined by the workflow and stakes, not by a fixed brand list: an asset is in scope when its value, authenticity, service history, provenance, insurance treatment, or intended transfer justifies better evidence. Initial category templates should cover watches, jewelry and gems, designer bags and leather goods, fine art, antiques, and selected collectibles. Vehicles, boats, real estate, and regulated financial assets can remain outside the first release because they already have more formal title systems and category-specific requirements.

The product is an evidence system, not a magic truth machine. It should answer six questions better than a folder of PDFs or a generic home-inventory app: What is the object? What evidence connects the record to the physical object? Who says each fact is true? What rights, custody, or interests attach to it? What changed over time? What evidence may safely be shared with a particular recipient?

Core user journey

6. **Capture and identify.** Photograph the item and its identifying marks; scan a barcode, serial, certificate, invoice, or QR code; use AI to propose brand, model, reference, materials, and category-specific fields; require the user to confirm every extracted fact.
7. **Assemble the evidence packet.** Attach receipts, warranty cards, appraisals, grading reports, prior bills of sale, service records, customs records, insurance schedules, estate documents, provenance correspondence, and condition images.
8. **Classify each assertion.** Separate a user's statement from a document-supported fact, a professional opinion, a brand or laboratory certificate, and a link to an authoritative registry. Display the source and date for each claim.
9. **Invite trusted attestations.** Let an appraiser, dealer, gem lab, authorized service center, insurer, executor, or fiduciary sign a limited statement about the facts within that party's competence.
10. **Maintain the life-cycle history.** Append service, appraisal, location, custody, insurance, loss, dispute, gift, inheritance, sale, and transfer events. Corrections supersede prior claims without erasing them.
11. **Share selectively.** Generate a time-limited evidence view or signed export for an insurer, appraiser, prospective buyer, trustee, executor, estate liquidator, family member, or law-enforcement contact.

12. **Transfer the dossier.** At gift, inheritance, or sale, the current holder initiates a transfer; the recipient accepts; disputed rights remain visible; private documents do not automatically move unless the owner authorizes them.

Evidence grades

A simple evidence ladder is one of the most important product decisions. It gives value to honest self-documentation without pretending that every uploaded record is equally reliable.

Grade	Meaning	Illustrative evidence
A — Self-recorded	Owner has created an identified record; no independent support yet	Owner photos, description, approximate purchase date
B — Document-supported	Claim is supported by a contemporaneous document	Receipt, warranty card, invoice, service record, insurance schedule
C — Professional-attested	Qualified third party has signed a limited opinion or observation	Credentialed appraisal, dealer inspection, watchmaker service statement
D — Issuer-confirmed	Brand, laboratory, creator, or authorized network has issued or confirmed a record	GIA report, brand digital passport, authorized retailer certificate
E — Authoritative link	Claim is linked to an appropriate external registry or custody record	Lost/stolen database result, court/custody record, registry receipt

Grades describe evidence strength, not guaranteed authenticity, market value, or legal title. Different claims within the same passport may carry different grades.

3. Why luxury goods are a sound starting market

Your team's instinct points to a commercially useful concentration of pain. Luxury goods combine high value with weak, fragmented recordkeeping. A single household may own a Rolex watch, Cartier jewelry, a Hermès bag, a painting, and a rare collectible, while the proof for those items lives across paper receipts, email, appraiser PDFs, service centers, insurance schedules, brand portals, marketplace certificates, and family memory. The object can move across borders and generations more easily than its documentation.

13. **The loss from poor documentation is real.** Missing papers can impair insurance recovery, resale confidence, estate administration, family distribution, and provenance.
14. **Owners have a reason to act before a transaction.** Insurance renewals, appraisals, service reminders, travel, storage, gifting, and estate planning create recurring moments of value.
15. **The data is structured enough to productize.** Category templates can capture serials, reference numbers, dimensions, hallmarks, grading reports, condition, service, provenance, and evidence sources.
16. **Professionals already touch the workflow.** Estate planners, appraisers, insurance brokers, jewelers, dealers, restorers, watchmakers, collection managers, and estate liquidators can introduce and validate the product.

17. **Cross-brand continuity is valuable.** Brand passports are excellent when they exist, but a family needs one private view across brands, categories, generations, and documents.

The recommended launch is therefore broader than a watch registry but narrower than a universal property registry: high-value movable luxury assets, served through estate, insurance, appraisal, and collection workflows. Watches remain a useful demonstration category because they have reference numbers, service histories, theft exposure, and active resale markets; they should not define the company.

4. Market map: competitors, complements and partners

The organizations that make P4's early architecture look so prescient do not all occupy the same strategic position. Some compete with one portion of the product, some issue evidence P4 should preserve, some could become integration or distribution partners, and others supply standards rather than products. Their existence validates the market, but it also means P4 must be positioned as the cross-brand, owner-and-professional evidence layer—not as the universal official authenticator.

Organizations / systems	Present role	Relationship to P4 and recommended approach
Aura Blockchain Consortium; Arianee	Brand-facing digital product passports, lifecycle events, ownership transfer, and customer experiences	Closest architectural competitors and later interoperability targets. Do not depend on them for launch; design P4 to preserve or exchange their records.
Rolex Certified Pre-Owned; Breitling Digital Passport; other brand programs	Brand-issued authentication, warranty, service, and transfer within participating ecosystems	Authoritative evidence issuers and adjacent competitors, not early startup dependencies. Preserve their certificates and identify the issuer.
GIA; Entrupy; specialist appraisers and authenticators	Category-specific grading, authentication, inspection, or professional opinion	Complementary attestation partners. P4 should ingest or link their results and never impersonate their expertise.
Enquirus; Art Loss Register	Lost/stolen, title-claim, and due-diligence records for watches, jewelry, art, antiques, and collectibles	Complementary data and possible integration partners. Link results and loss reports rather than building a competing crime database first.
Chrono24 Certified; eBay Authenticity Guarantee	Transaction-time authentication and buyer confidence inside a marketplace	Adjacent competitors and possible later channels. P4's record should exist before and survive after any marketplace transaction.
Artifcts; WAX; Verisart; collection and document vaults	Inventory, provenance, storytelling, certificates, insurance convenience, and document storage	More direct competition. Differentiate P4 through claim-level evidence, professional attestations, rights separation, and append-only history.
NAEPC; ASA; ISA; Appraisers Association of America	Professional education, credentials, practitioner communities, and local networks	Potential pilot and distribution partners, not competitors. Begin with individual members and local councils rather than seeking national endorsement.
IETF SCITT; W3C Verifiable Credentials; GS1 Digital Link / DPP; C2PA	Technical standards for signed statements, credentials, product identifiers, passports, and media provenance	Enabling standards, not competitors. Keep P4 compatible so it can accept and issue portable evidence instead of becoming another silo.

Competitive comparison is directional and based on publicly described services as of September 2026. It is not a full freedom-to-operate or market-clearance analysis.

Positioning rule: P4 should say “evidence-grade record” and “professionally attested passport,” not “official title,” “guaranteed authentic,” or “the blockchain proves it.” Rolex itself states that only Rolex can confirm the authenticity of a Rolex watch. P4 should preserve a Rolex certificate or qualified expert opinion and identify its issuer; it should not impersonate that authority.

5. The first customer and the first paid job

The first paid job should be: “Create and maintain an evidence-ready luxury-asset inventory that a family and its trusted professionals can use for insurance, estate planning, appraisal, loss, and transfer.” This is more defensible than a consumer-only collection gallery and more immediately useful than a speculative global title registry.

Primary customers

18. **Collector households and affluent families:** need one private record across categories and a clean handoff to spouse, trustee, executor, or heirs.
19. **Estate-planning attorneys, fiduciaries, and trust officers:** need reliable asset schedules, ownership/custody context, beneficiary instructions, and a usable record when incapacity or death occurs.
20. **Appraisers and category specialists:** need structured intake, evidence requests, versioned appraisals, and a way to issue limited attestations without assuming responsibility for unrelated claims.
21. **Insurance brokers and valuable-articles specialists:** need better schedules, current values, supporting documents, and claim-ready evidence.
22. **Dealers, auction houses, restorers, and collection managers:** need a durable record of inspection, condition, service, consignment, custody, and transfer.

Pilot customer profile

Recruit five to ten households with 10–40 high-value items each, introduced by three to five professionals in one region where you can participate directly. Seek category diversity—watches, jewelry, bags, art, and collectibles—without trying to support every edge case. The concierge pilot should document 75–150 assets and produce actual insurance, appraisal, and estate-planning outputs.

A successful pilot is not “people thought the demo was interesting.” It is evidence that users will complete records, invite a professional, return for an update, use an export in a real workflow, and pay. The test should also reveal which category creates the fastest onboarding and strongest willingness to pay; that category can then receive deeper automation without redefining the overall luxury-asset strategy.

6. Business model and defensible advantage

Recommended model: B2B2C

Professionals should be the distribution channel and trust layer; households should remain the long-term owner of their private asset dossier. A professional subscription can include client workspaces, structured intake, attestation tools, reports, and collaboration. A household plan can be purchased directly or bundled into a professional engagement. Verification, appraisal, and authentication services should be delivered by qualified partners and may carry transaction fees.

Initial pricing should be tested rather than declared as fact. Reasonable hypotheses are \$250–\$750 per month for a small professional practice, \$150–\$400 per year for a household vault, and category-specific service fees for paid attestations or concierge onboarding. Enterprise/API pricing can follow only after a repeatable workflow exists. The company should commit that it will not sell or advertise against private asset data.

What becomes the moat

23. **Evidence policy:** a clear, trusted grammar for sources, claims, uncertainty, supersession, and disputes.
24. **Professional network:** credentialed people and organizations willing to issue narrowly scoped attestations.
25. **Workflow integrations:** estate schedules, insurance submissions, appraisal updates, service events, loss reports, and controlled transfer.
26. **Longitudinal history:** the accumulated chain of evidence, custody, service, valuation, and transfer around each object.
27. **Cross-category continuity:** one owner-controlled system that can preserve evidence from many brands and specialist registries without pretending to replace them.

The ledger code itself is not the moat. A competent team can build append-only event storage. The hard and valuable work is deciding who may say what, how evidence strength is communicated, how the physical object is bound to its record, how corrections work, and how the record is used by professionals who already carry trust and liability.

7. Technology: modern standards, invisible complexity

The first version should use a conventional encrypted cloud architecture with an append-only event model. Private documents and personally identifying information should stay encrypted off-chain. Each claim, document, and event receives a cryptographic digest, issuer identity, timestamp, and status. The system can periodically obtain or publish an independent transparency receipt without exposing the underlying private content.

Layer	Recommended implementation	Reason
Capture and experience	Responsive web/mobile capture; image/document upload; OCR and AI-assisted field extraction; QR/NFC/serial support	Reduce the friction that kept old inventory systems empty.
Private records	Encrypted relational database and object storage; strict role-based access; audit logs; backups; export and deletion policy	Protect sensitive location, identity, value, and ownership data.
Evidence and history	Event-sourced claim model; digital signatures; hashes; supersession; dispute and resolution events	Implement the strongest P4 idea: history is preserved while views can change.
Interoperability	W3C Verifiable Credentials; GS1 Digital Link where applicable; C2PA for captured media; APIs and standard exports	Accept and issue portable evidence rather than creating another silo.
Independent receipts	IETF SCITT-compatible receipts or periodic public-chain anchoring when justified	Prove record inclusion and tamper evidence without publishing private data or forcing wallet UX.

AI should assist, not adjudicate

AI is useful for reading receipts, identifying likely brands and models, finding serial/reference patterns, flagging missing evidence, detecting inconsistent dates, and drafting descriptions. It should not issue an unqualified authenticity verdict or silently upgrade evidence. High-stakes conclusions should come from traceable documents, specialist tools, or qualified humans. Every AI-derived field should be labeled as a suggestion until confirmed.

8. Partners and organizations to involve

The pilot does not need endorsements from Rolex, LVMH, an insurer, or a national association to begin. It does need a small group of professionals willing to co-design the workflow and issue real attestations. Approach partners in an order that reduces dependence and produces evidence quickly.

28. **Local design partners.** Recruit estate-planning attorneys, professional fiduciaries, personal-property appraisers, jewelers, watchmakers, art advisers, estate liquidators, and valuable-articles insurance brokers. Ask them to test actual client cases, not only attend demonstrations.
29. **Professional associations.** Use local estate planning councils affiliated with NAEPC for education and pilot recruitment. Engage the American Society of Appraisers, International Society of Appraisers, and Appraisers Association of America for category expertise and potential practitioner outreach.
30. **Category authorities.** Design passports to preserve and verify evidence from GIA, brand service centers, Entrupy and other specialist authenticators, Enquirus, Art Loss Register, and equivalent category registries. Explore links or formal interoperability only after the product has traction.
31. **Passport-platform interoperability.** Treat Aura, Arianee, and brand passport programs as later integration targets. Build P4 so an owner's record can preserve their credentials without requiring those organizations to approve the initial pilot.

32. **Standards communities.** Align with W3C Verifiable Credentials, IETF SCITT, GS1 Digital Link/DPP, and C2PA. Participation in standards discussions can follow the pilot; the MVP should implement enough compatibility to avoid a proprietary dead end.
33. **Distribution partners.** After demonstrating paid use, approach insurance agencies, trust companies, wealth advisers, auction houses, estate services, storage providers, and luxury resale operators for embedded or co-branded workflows.

Practical partnership rule: Do not make the pilot contingent on a global brand partnership. Build an owner-controlled passport that is useful with uploaded evidence today and becomes stronger when a brand, lab, dealer, insurer, or registry later issues a machine-verifiable attestation.

9. Ninety-day validation plan

The first phase should be deliberately manual. A concierge workflow will reveal the evidence model, professional handoffs, privacy concerns, and actual willingness to pay before engineering hardens the wrong assumptions.

Period	Work	Deliverable	Decision evidence
Weeks 1–3	20–25 structured interviews across owners and professionals; map five real cases	Problem map, partner shortlist, category field set, privacy and liability requirements	At least 3 professional design partners and 5 households commit to a pilot
Weeks 4–6	Build clickable prototype and evidence schema; test luxury-asset capture and sharing	Prototype, evidence grades, rights/roles model, sample passport and reports	Users can understand evidence strength and complete one item without coaching
Weeks 7–10	Run concierge pilot across watches, jewelry, bags, art, and collectibles	75–150 asset records; professional attestations; estate/insurance/appraisal exports	Median guided capture under 15 minutes per item; professionals use at least 2 real outputs
Weeks 11–13	Test paid offers and define MVP	Pricing results, data-security plan, scoped backlog, pilot agreements, next-stage budget	At least 2 paid or contractually committed professional pilots and repeat use by households

Go / adjust / stop gates

34. **Go** if owners complete records, professionals use the outputs, and at least two channels will pay for a pilot.
35. **Adjust** if one category or one workflow dominates; deepen that module while retaining the cross-category data model.
36. **Stop or pause** if the only enthusiasm is for a demo, if no professional will rely on the output, or if onboarding remains too labor-intensive for the expected price.

10. Funding plan: staged capital, not one large leap

A friend-funded startup deserves especially clear gates. The recommended commitment is not an open-ended check for the whole historical P4 vision. It is a sequence of tranches released only when the preceding phase produces evidence. The ranges below are planning estimates; actual costs depend on founder compensation, local versus remote hiring, and how much development is contracted.

Stage	Indicative capital	Primary use	Release condition
0. Validation and concierge prototype (0–3 months)	\$25,000–\$50,000	Discovery, product design, clickable prototype, evidence/legal model, manual pilot, security plan	Initial authorization; fixed 90-day scope
1. Pilot MVP (months 4–9)	\$125,000–\$250,000	Small product/engineering team, secure capture, event history, professional portal, sharing, reports, first integrations	Design partners, paid commitments, usable data model, clear category/workflow focus
2. Commercial pilot (months 10–18)	\$350,000–\$750,000	Security hardening, attestations, API, mobile polish, onboarding operations, partner sales, compliance, support	Repeatable onboarding, measurable retention, professional renewals, credible unit economics
3. Scale financing	To be determined from evidence	Broader distribution, deeper category integrations, enterprise partnerships, national expansion	Do not price this phase until commercial-pilot data exists

Planning ranges exclude extraordinary litigation, acquisitions, nationwide paid media, and large brand integrations. Financing terms, valuation, and securities compliance require separate counsel.

Initial team

One of you should lead product governance, evidence policy, estate/fiduciary workflows, and early professional relationships. The first operating team should add one experienced product/technical lead, one or two full-stack engineers, a contract product designer/researcher, and part-time security/privacy and category counsel. Appraisers and luxury specialists should be paid advisers or pilot partners rather than full-time employees until volume justifies an internal verification operation.

Another role should be defined after the 90-day plan is agreed: founding investor, board/advisory participant, or both. Because the relationship is personal, responsibilities, information rights, decision authority, follow-on expectations, and exit scenarios should be documented with the same care used for an unrelated investor.

11. Scope discipline

The original documents contain several businesses. The startup should not launch them simultaneously. The rule is simple: every first-year feature must strengthen the P4 Asset Evidence Passport or a paid estate, insurance, appraisal, loss, or transfer workflow. Adjacent ideas can remain in the intellectual-property archive and return later as partnerships or separate ventures.

In practical terms, the first company should not become a lender, universal character-scoring system, emergency-response network, speculative token issuer, or self-appointed global title authority. Those directions add regulatory exposure, trust burdens, and entirely different buyers. Public-safety concepts such as Survivor Locator also now sit near established services such as Smart911 and public alert infrastructure; they deserve separate evaluation rather than dilution of this launch.

The same discipline applies to geography and governance. Start with a straightforward operating company and one regional pilot. A neutral standards body, international nonprofit, or global government-recognition effort becomes relevant only if third-party adoption later creates a genuine governance need.

12. Principal risks and how the plan addresses them

Risk	Why it matters	Mitigation
Trust and authority	A startup cannot simply declare facts about valuable property true	Show issuer and evidence grade; use qualified partners; limit every attestation to its scope.
Physical-to-digital binding	A genuine document can be attached to the wrong object	Use serials, hallmarks, forensic images, category checklists, secure tags where appropriate, and reinspection events.
Privacy and theft exposure	A database of valuable objects and locations is highly sensitive	Private-by-default architecture, minimal location data, encryption, strong access controls, monitoring, and security testing.
Liability	Users may rely on records in insurance, sale, or estate disputes	Clear evidence labels, professional scope, terms, errors-and-omissions coverage, and counsel-reviewed outputs.
Onboarding effort	Cataloging is valuable but easy to postpone	Concierge start, AI-assisted capture, professional triggers, and immediate outputs for insurance and estate planning.
Platform crowding	Brand and marketplace programs already exist	Be the cross-brand owner/professional evidence layer; ingest and preserve specialist evidence instead of duplicating it.

13. Intellectual property and company structure

The 2007 archive is valuable evidence of dated authorship, founder insight, and the evolution of the concept. It is not, by itself, a substitute for a current patentability, trademark, or freedom-to-operate review. Before a public product launch, counsel should review the new claim/evidence model, dispute and supersession workflow, professional attestation system, physical-digital binding methods, and generated estate/insurance outputs for protectable implementation details.

P4 should receive trademark and domain screening before material branding expense because the designation is short and widely used in unrelated fields. WARDTRAC can remain identified as a historical working name within the archive without competing with P4 as the commercial identity. New technical and product work should be assigned to the company, and advisers and developers should use

appropriate confidentiality and invention-assignment agreements. The archival materials should be preserved in their original form with a documented chain of custody.

14. Investment conclusion

Bottom line: Yes—pursue the project. Joel was ahead of his time on the architecture, and both Joel's and [REDACTED]'s interest in luxury goods identifies a commercially sensible launch category. The investable version is the focused P4 Asset Evidence Passport, distributed through trusted professionals and built in gated stages. The first decision is whether to fund a disciplined 90-day validation program, not whether to finance the full historical vision in one step.

If the pilot proves that families will complete records, professionals will rely on the outputs, and at least two channels will pay, the company will have earned the right to build the MVP. If the pilot reveals that one luxury category or workflow is markedly stronger, the team can concentrate there without abandoning the cross-brand evidence architecture. Either outcome creates useful knowledge at controlled cost.

The opportunity is not to outspend the luxury groups or replace their registries. It is to become the trusted connective tissue around valuable objects: the place where evidence from owners, brands, laboratories, appraisers, insurers, service providers, registries, fiduciaries, and transfers remains intelligible over time. That is the most durable part of Joel's original idea—and the part now worth building.

Appendix A — Minimum viable product requirements

Capability	MVP requirement	Acceptance test
Asset capture	Category templates for watches, jewelry/gems, bags/leather goods, art/antiques, and selected collectibles	A user can document a representative item in each category without inventing fields.
Evidence store	Encrypted photos, video, PDFs, certificates, receipts, appraisals, service and insurance documents	Every file has source, date, digest, access policy, and relationship to one or more claims.
Claim model	Issuer, subject, assertion, evidence, grade, status, effective date, and superseding event	A corrected claim remains historically visible and the current view is unambiguous.
Roles and rights	Owner, beneficial owner, custodian, fiduciary/agent, lienholder, creator, IP/rightsholder, beneficiary, and verifier	The system can represent split roles without implying a legal conclusion it cannot support.
Attestations	Invite a professional to sign a limited claim; verify issuer identity and credential metadata	Recipient can see exactly who attested to what, when, and under which evidence grade.
Sharing	Time-limited links and signed PDF/data exports with field-level disclosure	Owner can share insurance evidence without revealing address, collection value, or unrelated assets.
Reports	Collection schedule, insurer/appraiser packet, estate-planning schedule, executor inventory, transfer packet	Pilot professional uses at least two report types in a real client workflow.
History and disputes	Append-only events for capture, appraisal, service, transfer, challenge, evidence, resolution, and supersession	No user can silently rewrite a prior event; current and historical states both render correctly.
Security	MFA, encryption, least-privilege access, audit logs, backups, incident plan, secrets management	Independent security review before commercial pilot and documented restore/access tests.

Appendix B — Source materials and current market references

Archival materials reviewed

P4 Project Docs-Archive.pdf — P4 concept documents dated August–September 2007, including provenance, ownership, transfer, rights, privacy, and challenge workflows.

Walking Wealth.pdf — Walking Wealth and WARDTRAC concept, consumer utility, asset inventory, valuation, registry governance, and privacy model.

Survivor Locator.pdf — Separate May 2013 public-safety concept reviewed for portfolio scope.

P4 Project Title Sheets.pages — Archival title-sheet material.

Standards and market references

[IETF RFC 9943 — SCITT architecture](#) — Signed statements, append-only transparency, receipts, and accountability; Proposed Standard, June 2026.

[W3C Verifiable Credentials Data Model 2.0](#) — Issuer-holder-verifier model for tamper-evident, machine-verifiable credentials.

[GS1 Digital Product Passport](#) — Product-passport data structures and emerging product information standards.

[GS1 Digital Link](#) — Standardized web-resolvable product identifiers in QR and other carriers.

[C2PA](#) — Content provenance and authenticity for digital media.

[EU Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation 2024/1781](#) — Regulatory framework supporting digital product passports and lifecycle product information.

[Aura Blockchain Consortium](#) — Luxury-brand digital identities, product passports, authenticity, traceability, and ownership experiences.

[Arianee Passport Portal](#) — QR-accessed passports with certifications, maintenance history, role-based views, and ownership transfer.

[Rolex Certified Pre-Owned](#) — Brand-issued authentication and guarantee for qualifying pre-owned watches through official jewelers.

[Breitling Digital Passport](#) — Brand digital certificate, warranty information, and ownership transfer.

[Entrupy Luxury Authentication](#) — Specialist authentication and certificates for bags and leather goods.

[GIA Report Check](#) — Verification of gemological report information against GIA records.

[Enquirus](#) — Cross-brand lost/stolen watch and jewelry database and document vault.

[Art Loss Register](#) — Due-diligence and lost/stolen/title-claim database for art, antiques, and collectibles.

[Chrono24 Certified](#) — Verified-watchmaker authenticity checks within the watch marketplace.

[eBay Authenticity Guarantee](#) — Transaction-time authentication across watches, jewelry, handbags, and other categories.

[Verisart Certificates](#) — Evolving art certificates, physical links, and blockchain-recorded changes.

[Artifcts](#) — Legacy, inventory, value, provenance, insurance, and estate-planning documentation for meaningful objects.

[WAX](#) — Luxury collection inventory and insurance workflow.

[NAEPC](#) — National network of estate-planning councils and credentialed professionals.

[American Society of Appraisers — Personal Property](#) — Credentialed appraisal disciplines for insurance, estate, loss, and other purposes.

[International Society of Appraisers](#) — Education and practitioner network for personal-property appraising.

[Appraisers Association of America](#) — Independent appraiser and affiliated-professional network.

[Smart911](#) — Example of established public-safety profile and emergency-information infrastructure relevant to separate Survivor Locator evaluation.

This memo is a strategic product and business analysis. It is not legal, tax, insurance, appraisal, authentication, investment, or securities advice. All third-party names and trademarks are used descriptively; no affiliation or endorsement is implied.