

European International University, EIU-Paris

Doctoral Thesis

DIGITAL TRADE AND E-COMMERCE GOVERNANCE: INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL LAW CHALLENGES AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CROSS-BORDER TRANSACTIONS

Submitted by:

Mohammad Rateb Amro

Student ID: EIU87012642

In Partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Law & Policy in International Commercial Law and Digital Governance.

Supervisor:

Prof. (Dr.) Amit Kapoor

Date:

February 2026

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in this thesis, entitled "*Digital Trade And E-Commerce Governance: International Commercial Law Challenges And Policy Recommendations For Cross-Border Transactions*" has been undertaken and completed by me for the award of the Degree of **Doctor of Law & Policy in International Commercial Law and Digital Governance** with European International University, under the guidance of Prof. (Dr.) Amit Kapoor.

I also declare that this thesis is an original work and has not been submitted for any degree or diploma in any other university or institution. Further, I declare that the texts, figures, tables, and any other material taken from other sources have been acknowledged, referred to, and cited in the best of my knowledge and understanding.

Signature of Research Scholar,

Mohammad Rateb Amro



European International University

Date: February 2026

Place: UAE

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINALITY

This is to certify that the thesis entitled "*Digital Trade And E-Commerce Governance: International Commercial Law Challenges And Policy Recommendations For Cross-Border Transactions*" is a Bonafide research work conducted by ***Mohammad Rateb Amro*** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the **Doctor of Law & Policy in International Commercial Law and Digital Governance** degree from the European International University (EIU- Paris). This research was carried out under my supervision and guidance.

The thesis represents an original work undertaken in accordance with the academic regulations of the European International University. The content of this thesis reflects the independent research efforts of the candidate. This thesis has not been submitted for the award of any degree, diploma, or other qualification at any other university.



Signature of Supervisor

Prof. (Dr.) Amir Kapoor

Date: February 2026

Place: UAE

UNIVERSITY APPROVAL

This dissertation, titled "*Digital Trade And E-Commerce Governance: International Commercial Law Challenges And Policy Recommendations For Cross-Border Transactions*" has been examined and approved by the European International University (EIU-Paris) for the award of the **Doctor of Law & Policy in International Commercial Law and Digital Governance.**

Signature:



Name: Ky. Col. Prof. Dr. Edward Roy Krishnan

Position: Founder & Director General

European International University, Paris, France

Date:

University Seal:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A thesis that argues for institutional transformation must itself emerge from transformed thinking. Mine did. The ideas in these pages crystallised over twenty-eight years of legal practice across the Middle East and North Africa—years spent navigating the gap between the governance frameworks that exist and the commercial realities that demand something better. That gap is this thesis's subject. The colleagues, clients, adversaries, and interlocutors who populated those years are its unacknowledged co-authors.

My first and deepest debt is to my supervisor, [Supervisor Name]. Rigorous scholarship requires a supervisor willing to push back—not occasionally, but persistently and with precision. [Supervisor Name] did exactly that. The theoretical contributions in this thesis bear the marks of that pressure in every place where an easy formulation was replaced by a harder and more accurate one. I am genuinely grateful.

I acknowledge the faculty and research community at [Institution Name] for providing an environment in which a practitioner could become, in some meaningful sense, a scholar. The transition is not automatic. It requires interlocutors who take seriously the idea that twenty-eight years at the intersection of law and commerce in the Gulf and across MENA constitutes a form of knowledge worth theorising—not merely illustrating.

My career has been shaped by exceptional institutions. At Nestlé and Mondelēz International, I learned that legal counsel at the highest level is not reactive but structural—that the best legal work anticipates the commercial architecture of an enterprise before disputes arise. At the Abu Dhabi regulatory authorities, I was privileged to contribute to landmark legislation, including the Medical Liability Law of 2016, and came to understand governance not as an abstract discipline but as a craft requiring patience, precision, and genuine public purpose. At Agthia Group, where I have led a ten-person legal team across nine jurisdictions since 2020, I have tested every proposition in this thesis against the daily reality of cross-border commerce.

The Agthia team deserves specific acknowledgement. Managing complex multi-jurisdictional operations—reducing an entity structure from fifty-eight to thirty-eight entities, leading seven major cross-border acquisitions, establishing legal frameworks across the UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, India, and beyond—requires colleagues who combine legal excellence with commercial intelligence. I have been fortunate in mine.

To my family: this work was written in the hours you gave me, and the conviction it expresses was formed in the life we have built together. Twenty-five years in the UAE, far from where I

grew up in Jordan, have taught me that belonging is made, not found. You are what I have made it from. This thesis is dedicated to you.

Finally, I acknowledge the scholars whose work I engage, challenge, and build upon in these pages. Where I disagree with them, I do so in the spirit of a discipline that advances through productive contestation. Where I build upon them, I do so with the awareness that every original contribution stands on foundation's others have laid.

Any errors that remain are mine alone.

Mohammad Rateb Amro

Abu Dhabi

PREFACE

This thesis was not conceived in the abstract. It grew from twenty-five years of practice—advising multinationals on cross-border transactions, navigating the regulatory complexity of MENA jurisdictions, and encountering, repeatedly, the same fundamental problem: that the legal infrastructure governing international digital commerce is fragmented, outdated, and inadequate to the scale of what digital trade has become.

The specific question I set out to answer is deceptively simple: why, in an era of globally integrated digital commerce, do we still lack a coherent international legal framework to govern it? The answer, as these pages attempt to demonstrate, is neither technical nor political in isolation. It is structural. The existing international order was built for a world of physical goods, territorial jurisdiction, and state-to-state relations. Digital commerce inhabits none of those categories cleanly. It is borderless, intangible, algorithmically mediated, and platform-driven. The legal frameworks we have inherited are not merely incomplete—they are architecturally mismatched to the problem.

The Abu Dhabi Global Digital Trade Architecture (AGDTA) proposed in Chapter Five is not a speculative exercise. It is grounded in an institution—the Abu Dhabi Global Market—that I have observed closely and that has already demonstrated its capacity for governance innovation. The proposal is ambitious, but deliberate ambition is precisely what the current governance deficit demands.

A note on voice: this thesis is written in the first person where the argument is my own, and in the conventional academic register where I am surveying the work of others. I make no apology for the former. A doctoral thesis that advances original theoretical contributions should be prepared to own them.

ABSTRACT

The rapid expansion of cross-border digital commerce has exposed a profound structural mismatch between the architecture of international commercial law—designed for a world of tangible goods and territorial jurisdiction—and the realities of a borderless, platform-driven, data-intensive digital economy. This thesis analyses that mismatch systematically and proposes solutions grounded in both original theoretical contributions and implementable institutional design.

The analysis proceeds in four stages. Chapter Two surveys existing literature and theoretical foundations, identifying the conceptual gaps in current scholarship on digital trade governance. Chapter Three examines the international legal framework—WTO instruments, UNCITRAL model laws, OECD and G20 initiatives, and regional trade agreements—demonstrating that these instruments, while valuable, were not designed for the digital contexts they are now asked to govern. Chapter Four identifies five core legal challenges in cross-border e-commerce—jurisdictional fragmentation, consumer protection deficits, data governance divergence, digital taxation disputes, and inadequate dispute resolution—and introduces two original theoretical contributions: the doctrine of Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus, which reconceptualises territorial jurisdiction for digital contexts, and the theory of Algorithmic Legal Pluralism, which provides a framework for understanding the interaction between code-based governance and traditional legal orders.

Chapter Five develops the thesis's central institutional proposal: the Abu Dhabi Global Digital Trade Architecture (AGDTA), a seven-pillar governance framework operationalising two further theoretical contributions—Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling and Digital Trade Constitutionalism. The AGDTA is grounded in the demonstrated capacity of the Abu Dhabi Global Market (ADGM) and designed to complement rather than compete with existing international institutions.

The thesis makes five original contributions to international commercial law scholarship: Algorithmic Legal Pluralism; Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling; the Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus doctrine; Digital Trade Constitutionalism; and the Poly-Legal Adjudication model. Together, these contributions provide both the theoretical foundation and the practical architecture for a governance response adequate to the scale and complexity of contemporary digital commerce.

Keywords: digital trade governance; international commercial law; e-commerce regulation; cross-border data flows; algorithmic legal pluralism; regulatory sovereignty pooling; ADGM; dispute resolution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **iii**

PREFACE ..... **vii**

ABSTRACT ..... **viii**

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1. THE PROBLEM THIS THESIS ADDRESSES 2

1.2. OVERVIEW: DIGITAL TRADE AND ITS LEGAL CONTEXT 5

1.2.1. What Digital Trade Is and Why It Resists Conventional Legal Categories 5

1.2.2. The Evolution of E-Commerce Governance 6

1.3. THE INSTITUTIONAL LANDSCAPE 8

1.4. PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH 10

1.5. RESEARCH PROBLEM STATEMENT 11

1.6. RESEARCH QUESTIONS 12

1.7. SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH 13

1.8. RESEARCH APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY 14

1.9. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY 16

1.10. HYPOTHESES 17

1.11. ORGANISATION OF THE THESIS 18

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS **19**

2.1. PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL LAW IN DIGITAL TRADE 20

2.2. PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW AND CROSS-BORDER DIGITAL TRANSACTIONS 22

2.3. PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW AND CONFLICT OF LAWS IN E-COMMERCE 24

2.4. THEORIES OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND HARMONISATION IN TRADE LAW 26

CHAPTER THREE: THE INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR DIGITAL TRADE **28**

3.1. THE WTO FRAMEWORK AND ITS LIMIT 29

3.1.1. Existing WTO Agreements and Digital Trade 29

3.1.2. The Work Programme on Electronic Commerce 30

3.1.3. The Joint Statement Initiative on E-Commerce 31

3.1.4. The Structural Tension: Developed and Developing Countries 32

3.2. UNCITRAL: FOUNDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS 33
3.3. OECD AND G20: TAXATION AND DIGITAL ECONOMY GOVERNANCE 34
3.4. REGIONAL AND BILATERAL FRAMEWORKS 35
3.4.1. CPTPP and USMCA 35
3.4.2. The EU Digital Single Market 36
3.5. NATIONAL DIGITAL SOVEREIGNTY LAWS AND THEIR GLOBAL IMPLICATIONS 38
3.6. DATA PROTECTION AND THE CHALLENGE OF REGULATORY DIVERGENCE 39
CHAPTER FOUR: KEY LEGAL CHALLENGES IN CROSS-BORDER E-COMMERCE 40
4.1 JURISDICTION AND APPLICABLE LAW IN DIGITAL TRANSACTIONS 41
4.1.1. The Borderless Nature of Digital Commerce 41
4.1.2. The Limits of Party Autonomy 42
4.1.3. The Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus: An Original Theoretical Contribution 43
4.1.4. ADGM: A Case Study in Jurisdictional Innovation 45
4.2. CONSUMER PROTECTION IN CROSS-BORDER DIGITAL COMMERCE 46
4.2.1. The Structural Asymmetry of Digital Consumer Transactions 46
4.2.2. The Fragmented Regulatory Landscape 47
4.2.3. Platform Liability: The Unresolved Question 48
4.3. DATA GOVERNANCE AND THE PRIVACY ARCHITECTURE 49
4.3.1. The GDPR as a Global Standard 49
4.3.2. The Data Localisation Debate 50
4.3.3. Algorithmic legal pluralism: an original theoretical contribution 51
4.4. DIGITAL TAXATION AND THE JURISDICTIONAL IMPASSE 53
4.5.1. The Inadequacy of Traditional Litigation 54
4.5.2. International Arbitration: Potential and Limitations 55
4.5.3. Online Dispute Resolution: Progress and Gaps 56
CHAPTER FIVE: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND THE ABU DHABI GLOBAL DIGITAL TRADE ARCHITECTURE 57
5.1. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: EU, US, AND ASIAN APPROACHES 58
5.1.1. The European Union: Comprehensive Regulation and Extraterritorial Reach 58
5.1.2. The United States: Market-Orientation and Institutional Fragmentation 59
5.1.3. Asian Approaches: Diversity and Digital Sovereignty 60

5.1.4. Structural Gaps No Jurisdiction Has Resolved 61
5.2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE AGDTA 62
5.2.1. Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling 62
5.2.2. Digital Trade Constitutionalism 64
5.3. THE ABU DHABI GLOBAL DIGITAL TRADE ARCHITECTURE 66
5.3.1. The Case for Abu Dhabi 66
5.3.2. Pillar I: The ADGM Digital Trade Tribunal (ADTT) 68
5.3.3. Pillar II: The Global Digital Arbitration Centre (GDAC) 69
5.3.4. Pillar III: The Digital Trade Regulatory Convergence Initiative (DTRCI) 70
5.3.5. Pillar IV: The Abu Dhabi Data Sovereignty Solution (ADSS) 71
5.3.6. Pillar V: The AGDTA Digital Trade Code 72
5.3.7. Pillar VI: The AGDTA Academy 73
5.3.8. Pillar VII: The Digital Trade Innovation Sandbox 74
5.4. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION 75
5.4.1. Institutional Governance 75
5.4.2. Global South Inclusion 76
5.4.3. Implementation Roadmap 77
5.5. RESPONDING TO ANTICIPATED OBJECTIONS 78
5.5.1. 'Why Would States Cede Authority to Abu Dhabi?' 78
5.5.2. 'Existing Institutions Already Address These Issues' 79
5.5.3. 'The Proposal Is Too Ambitious' 80
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 81
6.1. ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP 82
6.1.1. Algorithmic Legal Pluralism 82
6.1.2. Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling 83
6.1.3. The Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus 84
6.1.4. Digital Trade Constitutionalism 85
6.1.5. The Poly-Legal Adjudication Model 86
6.2. SYNTHESIS OF KEY FINDINGS 87
6.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION 88
6.3.1. For UAE and Abu Dhabi Authorities 88
6.3.2. For International Organisations 89

6.3.3. For the Private Sector.....90
6.4. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS 91
6.5. FINAL REFLECTION 92
REFERENCES.....93

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1.THE PROBLEM THIS THESIS ADDRESSES

Consider a transaction that occurs countless millions of times each day. A consumer in Cairo purchases software from a platform incorporated in Dublin, the software is delivered from servers located in Frankfurt, payment is processed through a gateway in Singapore, and customer support is provided from Manila. When something goes wrong—when the software fails, when the consumer's personal data is misused, when a dispute arises over whether a contract was ever validly formed—which law governs? Which court has jurisdiction? Which regulatory authority has competence?

These questions do not have clean answers under any existing legal framework. They are not answered by the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services, which was drafted before the platform economy existed. They are not answered by UNCITRAL's model laws on electronic commerce, which predate cloud computing by a decade. They are not answered by the proliferating bilateral and regional trade agreements that contain digital trade chapters, because those chapters conflict with each other in ways that create confusion rather than clarity. They are not answered by national law, because national law is by definition territorial, and digital commerce is by definition not.

This is the problem this thesis addresses. It is not a new problem—scholars and practitioners have wrestled with the governance deficit in international digital commerce for more than two decades. What has changed is the scale. Global digital trade now represents a significant and growing share of world commerce. The governance deficit that was once an inconvenience has become a structural impediment to the functioning of the international economy. The costs—in commercial uncertainty, consumer harm, regulatory arbitrage, and foregone innovation—are no longer theoretical.

My position is that incremental adaptation of existing frameworks is insufficient. The structural mismatch between twentieth-century legal architecture and twenty-first-century digital commerce cannot be resolved by adding provisions to agreements designed for physical goods. What is required is a purpose-built institutional framework, grounded in sound theoretical foundations, that addresses the distinctive characteristics of digital commerce directly.

The Abu Dhabi Global Digital Trade Architecture (AGDTA) proposed in Chapter Five of this thesis is that framework. Its foundations are laid in the theoretical contributions developed in Chapters Four and Five. Its feasibility rests on the demonstrated capacity of the Abu Dhabi

Global Market, a jurisdiction I have observed closely over a decade of professional practice in the UAE. Its ambition is proportionate to the scale of the problem it addresses.

1.2.OVERVIEW: DIGITAL TRADE AND ITS LEGAL CONTEXT

1.2.1. What Digital Trade Is and Why It Resists Conventional Legal Categories

Digital trade encompasses the cross-border exchange of goods, services, and information through electronic communications and digital platforms. This definition is deceptively broad. It encompasses not only the straightforward purchase of physical goods through online marketplaces but also the delivery of intangible services—software, data analytics, cloud computing, financial technology, streaming media, digital education—and the cross-border transmission of data that underlies virtually all modern commerce, whether digital or physical.

What distinguishes digital trade from traditional commerce is not merely the medium of delivery but the fundamental alteration of the economic relationship between geography and commercial activity. Traditional commercial law is built on assumptions of physical presence: goods are manufactured somewhere, transported somewhere, delivered somewhere. Jurisdiction flows from these physical realities. Taxation follows the money to its physical destination. Consumer protection applies in the jurisdiction where the consumer physically resides. These assumptions do not survive contact with digital commerce.

A software-as-a-service contract involves no physical delivery. A platform facilitating peer-to-peer transactions may be legally incorporated in one jurisdiction, operationally based in a second, and subject to regulatory oversight in a dozen others simultaneously. Data generated by a consumer in one jurisdiction may be stored in a second, processed in a third, and monetised in a fourth—with no single jurisdictional authority having complete oversight of the cycle. The legal categories that exist were not designed for these realities, and they strain visibly when applied to them.

1.2.2. The Evolution of E-Commerce Governance

The governance of digital commerce has developed through recognisable phases, each responding to the commercial developments of its time without ever quite catching up to them.

The first phase, through the mid-1990s, was essentially ungoverned. Electronic transactions were novel, largely domestic, and addressed—imperfectly—through the application of general contract and commercial law. The legal questions that would become central to digital trade governance—the validity of electronic contracts, the liability of intermediary platforms, the enforceability of cross-border agreements reached through digital means—were already emerging, but the legal responses were ad hoc.

The second phase, from the late 1990s through the early 2000s, saw the first institutional responses. UNCITRAL's Model Law on Electronic Commerce (1996) and Model Law on Electronic Signatures (2001) established the principle of functional equivalence—that electronic documents and signatures should have the same legal validity as their paper counterparts—and provided reference frameworks for national legislation. The WTO's Work Programme on Electronic Commerce (1998) acknowledged the challenge of digital trade to the multilateral trading system, though it produced no binding outcomes. The EU's E-Commerce Directive (2000) addressed intermediary liability and cross-border online services within the Union. These instruments were significant advances, but they addressed the early, simpler phase of digital commerce—basic online transactions—rather than the platform economy, cloud computing, or algorithmic contracting that would follow.

The third phase, from the mid-2000s onwards, saw the explosion of the platform economy, the emergence of social media, the rise of cloud computing, and the transformation of data from a by-product of commercial activity into a primary economic asset. This phase also saw the fragmentation of regulatory responses. The European Union pursued increasingly comprehensive data protection regulation, culminating in the GDPR (2018). The United States maintained its sector-specific, market-oriented approach. China developed a comprehensive but restrictive data sovereignty framework. Emerging economies in the Global South adopted hybrid approaches. The resulting regulatory landscape is not merely diverse—it is actively fragmented in ways that impose significant compliance costs and create genuine uncertainty about which rules apply to which transactions.

We are now in a fourth phase, characterised by the maturation of platform economics, the emergence of AI-driven contracting, the proliferation of blockchain-based transactions, and the

increasing use of data as the primary currency of the digital economy. The legal frameworks inherited from earlier phases are inadequate to this phase in ways that are increasingly difficult to ignore.

1.3.THE INSTITUTIONAL LANDSCAPE

The current institutional landscape for digital trade governance is characterised by fragmentation, overlap, and jurisdictional competition rather than coherent coordination.

At the multilateral level, the World Trade Organization remains the primary institution for international trade governance but has struggled to translate its traditional mandate into effective digital trade disciplines. The 1998 Work Programme on Electronic Commerce has produced discussion but not binding outcomes. The Joint Statement Initiative on E-Commerce (2019), negotiated outside the WTO's formal consensus structure, represents an attempt by a subset of members to move forward but lacks universal participation and binding force. The customs duty moratorium on electronic transmissions, repeatedly extended since 1998, remains a temporary measure rather than a permanent rule. The WTO framework provides important background principles—non-discrimination, national treatment, market access—but it was not designed for digital trade and applies only indirectly and incompletely.

UNCITRAL continues to develop model laws and conventions that provide reference frameworks for national legislation, but its instruments are non-binding and their adoption is uneven. The 2005 UN Convention on the Use of Electronic Communications in International Contracts and the more recent work on digital identity and cloud computing are valuable contributions, but they address specific issues rather than the systemic governance deficit.

Regional frameworks—the EU's Digital Single Market, ASEAN's E-Commerce Agreement, the digital chapters in CPTPP, USMCA, and RCEP—represent significant advances in their respective contexts but are characterised by divergent approaches that create cross-regional friction rather than global coherence. The EU's rights-based, high-regulation approach conflicts with the US's market-oriented model; both conflict with China's data sovereignty framework; all three create compliance challenges for the Global South jurisdictions that are increasingly significant participants in digital commerce.

The ADGM, established in 2015 as an international financial centre applying English common law within the civil law framework of the UAE, has developed a distinctive and innovative approach to commercial law that is highly relevant to digital trade governance. Its significance

for this thesis extends beyond its role as a case study: it provides the institutional foundation for the AGDTA proposal developed in Chapter Five.

1.4.PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

This research has two related objectives. The first is analytical: to identify, with precision, why existing international legal frameworks are inadequate to govern digital trade, and to provide the theoretical tools for understanding why adaptation of existing frameworks will not suffice. The second is constructive: to propose an institutional framework that directly addresses the identified inadequacies and that is grounded in practical feasibility rather than theoretical idealism.

These objectives are connected by a methodological commitment. The analytical work is not undertaken merely to document problems—the literature on the inadequacy of digital trade governance is already substantial. It is undertaken to identify the structural sources of inadequacy in a way that generates specific, implementable solutions. The AGDTA proposal in Chapter Five is not appended to the analysis as an afterthought; it is the direct product of it.

1.5.RESEARCH PROBLEM STATEMENT

The central research problem is this: the governance of international digital trade is characterised by a structural mismatch between existing legal frameworks—designed for a world of physical goods, territorial jurisdiction, and state-to-state relations—and the distinctive characteristics of digital commerce, which is borderless, intangible, platform-mediated, data-intensive, and algorithmically governed. This mismatch produces identifiable harms: commercial uncertainty, consumer vulnerability, regulatory arbitrage, and barriers to market access for businesses in less-developed jurisdictions. Existing reform efforts—incremental adaptation of WTO rules, bilateral and regional digital trade chapters, national legislation—address symptoms rather than structural causes. What is required is a purpose-built governance framework that addresses the distinctive characteristics of digital commerce directly.

1.6.RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This research is structured around six questions:

- How far do existing international trade agreements and WTO frameworks extend in governing digital trade and cross-border data flows, and what are their structural limitations?
- What regulatory approaches are being negotiated in trade agreements on data flows, and what does the divergence between these approaches reveal about the underlying tensions in digital trade governance?
- What are the principal legal challenges in cross-border e-commerce—jurisdictional, consumer protection, data governance, taxation, and dispute resolution—and what theoretical frameworks best explain them?
- How should the relationship between data protection architectures and international commercial law be conceptualised, and what does a coherent governance model look like?
- What role does the Global South play in digital trade governance, and how can governance frameworks be designed to include rather than marginalise developing economies?
- What international legal framework is best suited to govern cross-border digital commerce in a way that balances economic development, consumer rights, and state sovereignty?

1.7.SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

This research focuses on the legal, regulatory, and policy dimensions of digital trade governance under international commercial law. It addresses transnational digital transactions and cross-border data flows, examining how international trade agreements, multilateral institutions, and national regulatory frameworks interact—and conflict—in governing digital commerce.

The research is not confined to developed economy perspectives. A recurring theme is the differential impact of existing governance frameworks on the Global South, and the AGDTA proposal explicitly incorporates mechanisms designed to ensure developing economy participation on terms that serve their interests rather than merely accommodating them.

The research does not address domestic e-commerce regulation in isolation, nor does it engage in depth with the economic dimensions of digital trade beyond what is necessary to understand the legal and governance challenges. It is a legal thesis, and its primary contribution is to legal scholarship and policy design.

1.8. RESEARCH APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed in this thesis combines three complementary approaches: doctrinal legal research, comparative analysis, and policy assessment. This combination is standard in international commercial law scholarship and is particularly well-suited to a research problem that is simultaneously theoretical and practical.

Doctrinal legal research forms the foundation. It involves systematic analysis of primary legal sources: international trade agreements, model laws, judicial decisions, arbitral awards, and regulatory instruments. The doctrinal analysis is not merely descriptive—it identifies gaps, ambiguities, inconsistencies, and structural inadequacies in existing frameworks that the constructive proposals are designed to address. Primary sources examined include: WTO agreements (GATS, the E-Commerce Work Programme, JSI documents); UNCITRAL instruments (Model Laws on Electronic Commerce and Electronic Signatures, the 2005 Electronic Communications Convention); OECD and G20 frameworks (BEPS Action Plans, the Two-Pillar Solution, digital economy governance principles); regional agreements (EU Digital Services Act, Digital Markets Act, CPTPP digital trade chapter, USMCA digital trade provisions, ASEAN E-Commerce Agreement); and national legislation (GDPR, CCPA, India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act, China's Cybersecurity Law and Personal Information Protection Law).

Comparative analysis places these frameworks in their jurisdictional contexts, identifying areas of convergence—such as the broad acceptance of electronic contract validity—and areas of fundamental divergence—such as data localisation requirements, platform liability standards, and approaches to digital taxation. The comparative analysis extends beyond the EU-US-China triad that dominates most existing scholarship to incorporate Global South perspectives, including the approaches of India, Brazil, Kenya, and the ASEAN bloc.

Policy assessment provides the bridge between analysis and prescription. It evaluates not only the legal adequacy of existing frameworks but their practical effectiveness, their inclusivity, and their adaptability to technological change. The policy assessment informs the design of the AGDTA proposal by identifying the specific governance functions that existing institutions perform inadequately and that a new framework would need to provide.

A note on disciplinary scope: while this thesis is anchored in international commercial law, its concerns extend naturally into the governance, institutional design, and capacity-building dimensions that the programme of study encompasses. The AGDTA framework proposed in

Chapter Five is, among other things, a study in how governance institutions are built, legitimised, and sustained—questions that sit at the intersection of law, leadership, and organisational design. The legal analysis provides the substance; the governance architecture provides the structure through which that substance is translated into institutional reality. A note on professional experience as a methodological resource: throughout this thesis, I draw upon my experience as a practising international commercial lawyer in MENA jurisdictions. This experience is not a substitute for rigorous analysis—it is a check on it. Where theoretical propositions are inconsistent with the practical realities of cross-border digital transactions as I have encountered them in practice, I have revisited those propositions. The result, I believe, is a thesis that is both theoretically coherent and practically grounded.

1.9. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The research pursues five specific objectives:

- To analyse the impact of data governance frameworks on international trade law, with particular attention to how regulatory divergence affects the conduct of digital transactions across borders.
- To evaluate the role of the Global South in digital trade governance negotiations, assessing both its current marginalisation and the mechanisms through which more meaningful participation could be achieved.
- To examine the principal policy constraints on cross-border data governance, mapping the tensions between data protection, national sovereignty, trade facilitation, and innovation.
- To identify the core legal challenges in cross-border digital commerce and to develop theoretical frameworks that explain them with sufficient precision to generate actionable governance solutions.
- To propose legal and policy reforms, embodied in the AGDTA framework, that address the identified challenges in a manner consistent with the principles of equity, commercial efficiency, and state sovereignty.

1.10. HYPOTHESES

This research tests two related hypotheses:

H1: The evolution of international commercial law towards digital trade governance will require not merely the adaptation of existing frameworks but the creation of purpose-built institutional architecture that directly addresses the distinctive characteristics of digital commerce—its borderlessness, intangibility, platform mediation, algorithmic governance, and data centrality.

H2: Effective reform of the international trade law regime governing digital commerce is achievable without requiring full regulatory harmonisation across jurisdictions, provided that governance frameworks are designed around the principle of regulatory sovereignty pooling—preserving formal state sovereignty while enabling functional coordination through shared institutions.

1.11. ORGANISATION OF THE THESIS

The thesis is organised in six chapters. This introduction establishes the problem, the research questions, the methodology, and the theoretical orientation. Chapter Two surveys existing literature and theoretical foundations, providing the scholarly context within which this thesis's contributions are situated. Chapter Three examines the international legal framework for digital trade—its institutions, its instruments, and its limitations. Chapter Four analyses the core legal challenges in cross-border e-commerce and introduces the theoretical contributions of Algorithmic Legal Pluralism and the Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus. Chapter Five develops the comparative analysis of major jurisdictions and presents the AGDTA framework, grounded in the theoretical contributions of Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling and Digital Trade Constitutionalism. Chapter Six synthesises the findings, articulates the original scholarly contributions, and sets out the implementation agenda.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Any serious engagement with digital trade governance requires first mapping the terrain that existing scholarship has established—and identifying precisely where that scholarship runs out. This chapter does both. It surveys the relevant literature in four areas: the principles of international commercial law as applied to digital trade; public international law and its engagement with cross-border digital transactions; private international law and conflict-of-laws questions in e-commerce; and theories of global governance and harmonisation. In each area, I identify the insights that existing scholarship offers, but also the gaps it leaves, and the theoretical work this thesis undertakes to fill them.

2.1. PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL LAW IN DIGITAL TRADE

The foundational question—whether and how traditional principles of international commercial law apply to digital trade—has generated a substantial literature. The dominant view, reflected in both scholarship and institutional responses, is one of functional equivalence: the legal principles governing physical commerce should apply to digital transactions, adapted as necessary to address the distinctive features of the digital medium. This view underlies the UNCITRAL model laws, which extend traditional contract law principles to electronic communications, and the WTO's initial engagement with e-commerce, which sought to apply GATS commitments to digital service delivery.

The functional equivalence approach has significant merits. It provides legal certainty by anchoring digital transactions in established legal principles. It avoids the complexity and controversy of creating entirely new legal categories for digital commerce. And it accurately reflects the commercial reality that many digital transactions are, in functional terms, simply more efficient versions of transactions that have always occurred—a software licence delivered electronically is legally analogous to a software licence delivered on a physical disk.

But the functional equivalence approach has limitations that become acute in the more complex dimensions of digital commerce. Fox (2018) provides a comprehensive analysis of the application of international commercial agreement principles to electronic commerce, demonstrating both the utility and the limits of extending existing frameworks. His analysis is strongest where digital commerce closely resembles traditional commerce; it is least adequate where the distinctive features of digital transactions—automated contracting, algorithmic decision-making, platform intermediation, data-as-consideration—have no physical analogue. Meltzer (2019) develops this critique specifically in the WTO context, arguing that the governance of digital trade requires not merely the application of existing trade law but the development of new disciplines addressing the specific characteristics of digital trade that existing frameworks cannot accommodate.

The role of data as a primary economic asset has emerged as a central challenge to the functional equivalence approach. Aaronson and Leblond (2018) demonstrate that the rise of three dominant data realms—those of the United States, the European Union, and China—has created a tripartite governance structure in which fundamentally different approaches to data as an economic and political resource are in direct tension. The US treats data primarily as a commercial asset, subject to market-oriented regulation with limited government intervention.

The EU treats personal data primarily as a right, subject to comprehensive regulation through the GDPR framework. China treats data as a sovereign resource, subject to comprehensive state oversight and control. These three models are not merely different—they are architecturally incompatible in ways that create genuine governance conflicts rather than merely different compliance requirements.

Gao (2018) examines this tripartite conflict in the WTO context, demonstrating that the US-China divergence on digital trade reflects not merely commercial differences but fundamentally different conceptions of the relationship between state sovereignty and digital commerce. The US model prioritises the free flow of data as a prerequisite for digital trade liberalisation; the Chinese model treats data sovereignty as a prerequisite for national security. These positions are not easily reconciled through the incremental negotiation processes that have produced WTO agreements on goods and services, because they reflect different fundamental values rather than different commercial interests.

Mitchell and Mishra (2019) provide the most systematic analysis of how WTO rules can be reformed to address cross-border data flows, arguing for a reformed framework that combines internet openness guarantees with provisions for legitimate domestic policy exceptions. Their analysis demonstrates the potential for WTO reform in this area but also its limits: the WTO framework, even reformed, addresses the trade dimensions of digital commerce rather than the full range of governance challenges that this thesis identifies.

Burri and Polanco (2020) contribute an important empirical dimension through their TAPED dataset, which systematically maps digital trade provisions in preferential trade agreements. Their analysis reveals both the proliferation of digital trade provisions in recent agreements and the fundamental divergence in their content—divergence that, this thesis argues, reflects the absence of a coherent theoretical framework rather than merely different commercial preferences.

What the existing scholarship on international commercial law principles establishes, in aggregate, is that functional equivalence provides a useful starting point but not a complete solution. The more distinctive features of digital commerce—algorithmic contracting, platform intermediation, data-as-consideration, smart contracts—require new legal doctrine rather than extension of existing categories. This is the gap that the Algorithmic Legal Pluralism framework developed in Chapter Four is designed to fill.

2.2. PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW AND CROSS-BORDER DIGITAL TRANSACTIONS

The engagement of public international law with digital trade has been shaped by two dominant concerns: the maintenance of state sovereignty over digital infrastructure and data, and the promotion of cross-border digital commerce through reduction of regulatory barriers. These concerns are frequently in tension, and the scholarship reflects that tension.

Herdegen (2024) provides the most comprehensive recent overview of the principles of international economic law as applied to digital contexts, demonstrating how the traditional concepts of WTO law—non-discrimination, national treatment, market access—interact with the distinctive regulatory challenges of the digital economy. His analysis of the tension between international standards encouraging liberalisation and the reassertion of state sovereignty in the digital domain is particularly relevant to this thesis's argument about the inadequacy of existing frameworks.

The WTO context is examined in detail by Nahnybida et al. (2022), who assess the interaction between trade agreements, digital development, and international commercial arbitration, and by Azmeh, Foster and Echavarri (2020), who examine the politics of the international trade regime's engagement with digital commerce. Both works demonstrate that the governance of digital trade is not merely a technical legal problem but a political one—the result of competing national interests that existing multilateral institutions are not well designed to resolve.

The question of jurisdiction in public international law terms—which states have the right to regulate digital activities within their territory or by their nationals—is addressed most directly by Khan (2024), who examines the WTO's role in balancing trade, sovereignty, and global governance. His analysis highlights the particular challenge of digital commerce for the sovereignty-respecting framework of international law: digital activities routinely produce effects in multiple jurisdictions simultaneously, and the traditional connecting factors that determine jurisdictional competence—physical location, nationality, domicile—are difficult to apply to activities that have no inherent physical location.

The governance theory literature provides important complementary perspectives. Kacowicz (2018) examines the links between regional and global governance, providing a framework for understanding how regional digital trade frameworks interact with global governance institutions. Zürn (2018) develops a theory of global governance grounded in authority, legitimacy, and contestation that is directly applicable to the governance challenges of digital

commerce: the authority of global governance institutions in the digital space is contested by states asserting digital sovereignty, and the legitimacy of those institutions is challenged by their inadequacy to the problems they are asked to address. Abbott et al. (2021) examine the role of intermediary organisations in global governance, which is relevant to this thesis's proposal for a new institutional framework that bridges national, regional, and global governance levels.

What the public international law literature establishes is that the governance of digital trade cannot be achieved through the application of existing jurisdictional principles alone. The distinctive characteristics of digital commerce—its borderlessness, its simultaneous presence in multiple jurisdictions, its operation through global platforms that are legally incorporated in one place but commercially active everywhere—require new jurisdictional concepts. The Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus doctrine developed in Chapter Four is a direct response to this gap.

2.3. PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW AND CONFLICT OF LAWS IN E-COMMERCE

The private international law dimension of digital trade governance—the determination of which court has jurisdiction and which law governs in cross-border digital disputes—has generated some of the most technically sophisticated scholarship in the field.

Svantesson (2021) provides the most comprehensive analysis of the interaction between private international law and the internet, demonstrating how traditional jurisdictional doctrines—territorial validity, nationality, domicile—have been rendered inadequate by the borderless nature of digital transactions. His central argument, that internet commerce has eliminated the geographical boundaries on which traditional private international law was built, directly supports this thesis's contention that new legal doctrine is required. His analysis of courts struggling with internet defamation, e-commerce litigation, and data protection conflicts across jurisdictions demonstrates the practical costs of the current inadequacy.

Asensio (2024) provides a more recent analysis of conflict of laws in the internet context, examining how courts have attempted to adapt existing doctrines—effects doctrine, targeting doctrine, habitual residence—to digital transactions. His analysis demonstrates that while some adaptations have been successful in limited contexts, they do not provide the systematic framework that cross-border digital commerce requires.

The specific challenge of consumer protection in cross-border e-commerce is addressed by Shaik and Poojasree (2021), who analyse the legal and compliance framework applicable to digital market transactions, and by Trimble (2020), who examines targeting factors and conflict of laws on the internet. Both works demonstrate the particular vulnerability of consumers in cross-border digital transactions, where the complexity of jurisdictional rules and the practical difficulty of enforcement across borders leave consumers without effective redress.

The intellectual property dimension of private international law in digital contexts is examined by Basedow et al. (2022) and by Kur and Maunsbach (2019). The former provides a comprehensive analysis of intellectual property in the conflict of laws, demonstrating how existing frameworks—designed for the relatively straightforward case of IP infringement in a single jurisdiction—struggle with the complex multi-jurisdictional infringement scenarios that digital commerce routinely generates. The latter examines choice-of-law questions in IP contexts specifically, arguing for a more flexible approach to governing law selection that better accommodates the realities of digital distribution.

The dispute resolution dimension is addressed by Sampani (2021), who examines online dispute resolution in e-commerce and the prospects for consensual international frameworks, and by Amro (2019), who provides a comparative analysis of online arbitration in cross-border commercial transactions across common law and civil law systems. Both works demonstrate both the potential and the limitations of existing ODR frameworks, supporting this thesis's argument for a more comprehensive dispute resolution architecture.

What the private international law literature establishes is that existing conflict-of-laws doctrines can be adapted to address some digital commerce challenges but that this adaptation is incomplete, inconsistent, and productively uncertain in ways that impose real costs on commercial parties. The AGDTA proposal in Chapter Five addresses the dispute resolution dimension of this challenge through the ADGM Digital Trade Tribunal and the Global Digital Arbitration Centre.

2.4. THEORIES OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND HARMONISATION IN TRADE LAW

The broader governance theory literature provides the conceptual framework within which this thesis's institutional proposals are situated.

The harmonisation debate in international trade law scholarship has been shaped by the fundamental tension between the efficiency gains of uniform rules and the sovereignty costs of ceding regulatory autonomy. Buckley et al. (2022) examine this tension in the context of the global factory model, demonstrating how supply chain integration creates pressure for regulatory coordination that existing multilateral frameworks are not well designed to provide. Their analysis of multinational enterprises navigating diverse regulatory environments directly illustrates the compliance costs that governance fragmentation imposes.

Kwilinski et al. (2019) provide an analysis of e-commerce concepts and legal regulation that situates the governance challenge in its institutional context, demonstrating the role of international institutions—UNCITRAL, UNECE, the UN Centre for Trade Facilitation and E-Business—in developing governance frameworks and the gaps that their work leaves. Their analysis of the interaction between international norms and domestic regulatory environments is relevant to this thesis's argument about the appropriate relationship between the proposed AGDTA and existing international institutions.

The relationship between digitalisation and international trade patterns is examined by Ahmedov (2020), who demonstrates the transformative effect of digitalisation on international trade structures, and by González and Ferencz (2018), who examine the market openness implications of digital trade. Both works establish the economic stakes of getting digital trade governance right—and the costs of getting it wrong.

The techno-geopolitical dimension of digital governance is addressed by Luo and Van Assche (2023), who examine the implications of the US CHIPS and Science Act as a manifestation of techno-nationalism that threatens the open, rules-based framework within which digital trade has developed. Their analysis of the shift from liberal multilateralism to interventionist techno-nationalism is directly relevant to this thesis's argument that the window for establishing effective international digital trade governance institutions may be narrowing.

The theoretical gap in the existing governance literature is the absence of a coherent framework for what this thesis terms Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling: a model for transnational

governance that preserves formal state sovereignty while enabling functional coordination through shared institutions. Existing governance theory offers three main models—supranationalism (typified by the EU, which transfers sovereignty), treaty coordination (which creates obligations without institutional capacity), and regulatory networks (which enable information sharing without binding authority). None of these models is adequate to the governance challenges of digital commerce. The Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling framework developed in Chapter Five is designed to fill this gap.

Shenkar, Luo and Chi (2021) and Hamilton and Webster (2018) provide contextual analysis of the international business environment within which digital governance operates, demonstrating the complexity of the regulatory and competitive landscape and the importance of governance frameworks that are adaptable to rapid change. Devereux and Vella (2018) and Skaar (2020) address the taxation dimension, demonstrating the inadequacy of existing tax frameworks for the digital economy and the stakes of the unresolved digital services tax debate.

The literature surveyed in this chapter allows the theoretical gap this thesis addresses to be stated with precision. It is not simply that existing frameworks are incomplete—that much is widely acknowledged. The gap is structural and threefold. First, no existing theory adequately accounts for algorithmic systems as autonomous normative orders rather than merely private ordering subject to law; Teubner identifies the phenomenon but does not develop the institutional response it requires. Second, no existing governance model provides a framework for transnational coordination that combines voluntary participation, variable geometry, and binding institutional capacity simultaneously; the three dominant models—supranationalism, treaty coordination, and regulatory networks—each provide one or two of these features but not all three. Third, no existing jurisdictional doctrine provides workable criteria for digital trade contexts that are graduated, predictable, and calibrated to the nature of digital engagement rather than physical presence. These three gaps are not independent—they are interconnected manifestations of the same underlying structural problem: that the conceptual architecture of international commercial law was built for a world of physical goods, territorial presence, and state-to-state relations, and that architecture does not transfer to digital commerce without fundamental reconstruction. The five theoretical contributions developed in Chapters Four and Five are designed to provide that reconstruction. The AGDTA is designed to translate it into institutional reality.

CHAPTER THREE: THE INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR DIGITAL TRADE

The international legal framework governing digital trade did not emerge from a coherent design process. It accumulated incrementally—through WTO negotiations that predated the platform economy, through UNCITRAL model laws drafted before cloud computing existed, through OECD principles developed in response to specific tax avoidance concerns, through bilateral and regional trade agreements that reflected the negotiating priorities of their parties rather than a systematic approach to digital governance. Understanding this framework requires appreciating not only what it contains but how it came to be—and why its origins explain much of its inadequacy.

3.1.THE WTO FRAMEWORK AND ITS LIMIT

3.1.1. Existing WTO Agreements and Digital Trade

The WTO framework was not designed for digital trade, but it applies to it by default. The General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) covers services delivered electronically, and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) protects digital content. The Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and the Agreement on Import Licensing Procedures have some application to digital products. But these instruments apply to digital trade only to the extent that digital transactions resemble the physical trade scenarios they were designed to govern—and that resemblance is increasingly attenuated.

The GATS classification problem illustrates the difficulty. Whether a particular digital service falls under Mode 1 (cross-border supply) or Mode 2 (consumption abroad) has significant implications for the applicable disciplines, but digital delivery often makes the distinction impossible to apply in practice. A consumer in Abu Dhabi accessing a US-based software platform is simultaneously consuming a service that crosses borders and consuming it abroad. The classification determines the level of market access commitments applicable, but the digital reality resists clean categorisation.

The non-discrimination principles—most-favoured nation treatment and national treatment—apply to digital trade where WTO obligations cover the relevant service sector. But coverage is uneven, schedules of commitment were negotiated for physical services and frequently do not contemplate digital delivery modes, and the horizontal limitations that many members have attached to their schedules create ambiguity about the extent of their digital trade commitments.

3.1.2. The Work Programme on Electronic Commerce

The WTO's Work Programme on Electronic Commerce, established by the 1998 Ministerial Conference, represents the institution's primary formal engagement with digital trade governance. It tasked the relevant WTO bodies—the Council for Trade in Services, the Council for Trade in Goods, the Council for TRIPS, and the Committee on Trade and Development—with examining the trade-related issues arising from global electronic commerce.

The Work Programme's most visible output has been the customs duty moratorium on electronic transmissions, first agreed in 1998 and renewed at successive Ministerial Conferences. The moratorium prevents WTO members from imposing customs duties on electronic transmissions, preserving the duty-free status of digital trade that has characterised the internet era. But the moratorium has always been temporary and has always been controversial—developing countries have argued that it foregoes revenue they need and that it was established before they had the capacity to negotiate its terms effectively. The question of whether to make the moratorium permanent remains unresolved.

More broadly, the Work Programme has produced analysis and discussion without generating binding outcomes. The reasons are structural rather than merely political. The WTO's consensus-based decision-making requires agreement among members with fundamentally different interests and approaches to digital trade—the US's liberalisation agenda, the EU's regulation agenda, China's sovereignty agenda, and the diverse interests of developing countries are not easily reconciled within a framework designed for incremental tariff negotiation.

3.1.3. The Joint Statement Initiative on E-Commerce

The Joint Statement Initiative on E-Commerce (JSI), launched at the 2019 Buenos Aires Ministerial Conference by a group of seventy-six WTO members, represents an attempt to move forward on digital trade disciplines outside the consensus framework. The JSI negotiations, now involving more than ninety members accounting for the substantial majority of world trade, are developing rules on electronic transactions, data flows, privacy, consumer protection, and related issues.

The JSI has significant potential but also significant limitations. Its plurilateral character means that any outcomes will bind only participating members, creating the risk of a two-tier system that further fragments digital trade governance. Its negotiating dynamics reflect the same US-EU-China tensions that have constrained the broader Work Programme. And its focus on replicating or extending the digital trade provisions found in recent preferential trade agreements—CPTPP, USMCA—means that its outcomes may replicate the fragmentation of those agreements at a larger scale rather than addressing the structural governance deficit.

The JSI is valuable and should be supported, but it is not a substitute for the more comprehensive institutional framework this thesis proposes.

3.1.4. The Structural Tension: Developed and Developing Countries

The most fundamental tension in WTO digital trade governance is the divergence between developed and developing country interests. Developed countries—primarily the US and EU—have generally favoured liberalisation, seeking to lock in the market access advantages their digital companies enjoy in global markets. Developing countries have been more cautious, for understandable reasons: they are primarily markets for digital services rather than exporters; their domestic digital industries need policy space to develop; their regulatory capacity is limited; and they have legitimate concerns about the distribution of the gains from digital trade.

The standard developed country narrative frames developing country caution as protectionism or regulatory overreach. This narrative is too simple. The concerns of developing countries about digital sovereignty, regulatory autonomy, and inclusive participation in the digital economy are substantively legitimate. A governance framework that locks in current competitive asymmetries under the banner of liberalisation is not neutrally beneficial—it systematically advantages those who are already advantaged.

The AGDTA proposal in Chapter Five addresses this tension directly through structural inclusion mechanisms, differential obligations for developing economies, and a capacity-building infrastructure that treats developing country participation as a governance priority rather than an afterthought.

3.2.UNCITRAL: FOUNDATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

UNCITRAL's contributions to digital trade governance are the most technically sophisticated of any international institutions, and they are genuinely significant. The Model Law on Electronic Commerce (1996) established the functional equivalence principle as an internationally recognised standard for the legal validity of electronic contracts and communications. The Model Law on Electronic Signatures (2001) provided a framework for digital authentication. The United Nations Convention on the Use of Electronic Communications in International Contracts (2005) extended these principles to the international convention level. More recently, UNCITRAL has developed model provisions on cloud computing, digital identity, and electronic transferable records, addressing specific dimensions of the contemporary digital economy.

These instruments have been widely adopted and have provided an important stabilising influence on national legislation in jurisdictions that have used them as reference frameworks. The functional equivalence principle, in particular, has become a foundational concept in digital commerce law globally—the proposition that an electronic document or signature should not be denied legal effect solely because it is in electronic form is now so widely accepted as to be almost unremarkable.

But UNCITRAL's institutional design creates inherent limitations. Its instruments are model laws and conventions—they provide reference frameworks for national legislation but create no binding international obligations. Their adoption is voluntary and uneven, and even where adopted, national implementation varies in ways that undermine the harmonisation they are intended to produce. UNCITRAL has no implementation infrastructure, no dispute resolution capacity, and no mechanism for ensuring that the frameworks it develops are applied consistently across jurisdictions.

Most fundamentally, the UNCITRAL model laws were drafted in an era when the primary challenge was establishing the legal validity of electronic transactions. That challenge has been substantially met. The current challenges—algorithmic contracting, platform liability, AI-driven commercial decisions, cross-border data governance—were not on UNCITRAL's drafting horizon in 1996, and the existing instruments do not address them adequately. The AGDTA's Digital Trade Code, proposed in Chapter Five, is designed as a purpose-built complement to UNCITRAL's foundational work, addressing the legal challenges of contemporary digital commerce that UNCITRAL's existing instruments do not reach.

3.3.OECD AND G20: TAXATION AND DIGITAL ECONOMY GOVERNANCE

The OECD's engagement with digital trade governance has been primarily focused on taxation—specifically, the problem that existing international tax rules, premised on physical presence as the basis for taxing rights, are inadequate for digital businesses that can generate significant revenue in a jurisdiction without any physical establishment there.

The BEPS Project (Base Erosion and Profit Shifting), launched in 2013, identified the taxation of the digital economy as one of its primary challenges. BEPS Action 1 examined the options for addressing the tax challenges of the digital economy and concluded that the digital economy could not be ring-fenced for separate treatment—the digital economy was becoming the economy. The Two-Pillar Solution announced in 2021, representing agreement among 137 countries on a new international tax framework, addresses this challenge through a combination of revised nexus rules that allow source-country taxation of large digital businesses without physical presence (Pillar One) and a global minimum corporate tax of fifteen percent (Pillar Two).

The Two-Pillar Solution represents a genuine achievement in international tax cooperation. But its implementation has been slower and more contested than its announcement suggested, particularly on Pillar One, where the complexity of the rules and the political opposition of the US have delayed the entry into force of the multilateral convention that would give them legal effect. The proliferation of unilateral Digital Services Taxes by individual countries, which the Two-Pillar Solution was partly designed to replace, has continued—creating the precisely the fragmentation the Solution was designed to avoid.

The broader OECD digital economy governance principles—on privacy, consumer protection, data governance, and cross-border regulatory cooperation—provide valuable policy frameworks but lack binding force. The APEC Privacy Framework provides a model for regional privacy interoperability, and the Cross-Border Privacy Rules (CBPR) system it has generated is an example of functional equivalence recognition at the regional level. These are instructive models for the AGDTA's regulatory convergence initiative.

3.4.REGIONAL AND BILATERAL FRAMEWORKS

The most detailed and technically sophisticated digital trade disciplines are found not in the WTO framework but in regional trade agreements—specifically in the digital trade chapters of CPTPP, USMCA, and RCEP, and in the EU's Digital Single Market framework.

3.4.1. CPTPP and USMCA

The Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) and the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) represent the most comprehensive digital trade disciplines in force. Their digital trade chapters address cross-border data flows, data localisation prohibition, source code protection, electronic authentication, consumer protection, and cybersecurity cooperation. Both agreements prohibit requirements for data localisation—the practice of requiring data to be stored or processed within a country's territory—as a barrier to trade, subject to limited exceptions for legitimate public policy objectives.

These provisions represent a significant advance in digital trade governance. They establish binding disciplines on data localisation and cross-border data flows that go beyond anything the WTO framework provides. Their consumer protection provisions, requiring parties to have laws protecting consumers from fraudulent and deceptive commercial practices online, establish a minimum standard for consumer protection in e-commerce.

But the US-model framework that these agreements embody is not neutral. Its prohibition on data localisation requirements reflects the commercial interests of US technology companies that depend on the free flow of data across borders. Its provisions on source code protection reflect the interests of US software developers. Its relatively limited consumer protection provisions reflect the US preference for market-oriented rather than regulatory approaches. The adoption of this model in trade agreements does not represent a consensus solution to digital trade governance—it represents the projection of a particular regulatory model through trade agreement disciplines.

3.4.2. The EU Digital Single Market

The European Union's approach to digital trade governance is qualitatively different from the US model, and the difference is not merely a matter of degree. The EU framework—built around the GDPR, the Digital Services Act (DSA), and the Digital Markets Act (DMA)—treats data protection as a fundamental right, platform accountability as a regulatory obligation, and market competition as a public interest to be actively maintained rather than left to market forces.

The GDPR has become the most consequential single piece of digital regulation in the world, not because of the EU's market size alone but because its extraterritorial reach—it applies to any organisation processing the personal data of EU residents, regardless of where that organisation is located—has made it a de facto global standard. Its adequacy decisions, which determine which countries provide sufficient data protection to receive EU personal data, have given the EU significant leverage over the regulatory choices of third countries.

The DSA and DMA, which entered into full application in 2024, represent the EU's attempt to impose comprehensive accountability obligations on large platforms and to constrain the market power of digital gatekeepers. These instruments are the most ambitious regulatory interventions in digital markets by any jurisdiction, and they are generating significant transatlantic tension—the US has raised concerns about their extraterritorial reach and their potential discriminatory effect on US technology companies.

The EU framework is more protective of individual rights and more aggressive in constraining platform power than any alternative. Its limitation as a global governance model is precisely its ambition: the comprehensive regulatory architecture it requires is beyond the capacity of most jurisdictions to replicate, and its extraterritorial application creates friction with jurisdictions that have made different regulatory choices.

3.4.3. **RCEP and Asian Approaches**

The Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), in force since 2022 and covering the ASEAN bloc plus China, Japan, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand, contains a digital trade chapter that reflects the diversity of its membership. Its provisions on cross-border data flows and data localisation are weaker than CPTPP and USMCA—reflecting the different interests of members including China—and its consumer protection provisions are less detailed. But RCEP is significant for the sheer scale of its membership: it covers approximately thirty percent of world trade and population.

China's approach to digital governance—comprehensive data sovereignty, mandatory localisation for certain data categories, platform regulation through the Cybersecurity Law, Data Security Law, and Personal Information Protection Law (PIPL)—represents a third model that is neither the US liberal approach nor the EU rights-based approach. It is a state-sovereignty approach, in which data is treated as a strategic national resource subject to comprehensive government oversight. This model is replicated in varying degrees across a number of developing countries that have looked to China's digital governance framework as an alternative to Western models.

The coexistence of three fundamentally different regulatory models—US liberal, EU rights-based, Chinese state-sovereignty—in the framework of regional trade agreements creates regulatory complexity that imposes real costs on businesses operating across multiple regional markets. It is this complexity that the AGDTA's regulatory convergence initiative is designed to address.

3.5.NATIONAL DIGITAL SOVEREIGNTY LAWS AND THEIR GLOBAL IMPLICATIONS

The assertion of digital sovereignty—the claim of states to regulate digital activities within their territory and involving their nationals—has become a defining feature of the contemporary digital governance landscape. Every jurisdiction exercises some form of digital sovereignty through data protection laws, cybersecurity requirements, platform regulation, and content moderation obligations. The divergence is not in the exercise of digital sovereignty itself but in the models adopted and the extent to which those models are compatible with cross-border digital commerce.

The implications for businesses engaged in cross-border digital trade are significant. A company offering digital services globally must navigate not merely different data protection regimes but architecturally different conceptions of the relationship between data, individual rights, commercial interests, and state authority. The compliance costs are substantial, and the legal uncertainty—particularly about which jurisdiction's law applies to any given transaction—is real.

The resolution to this tension, which is a central theme of this thesis, does not lie in requiring harmonisation of these fundamentally different regulatory models. The political prerequisites for such harmonisation do not exist, and the normative case for requiring all jurisdictions to adopt any single model is weak. The resolution lies in Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling—a framework in which states preserve their formal regulatory authority while pooling specific governance competences in shared institutions that provide functional coordination without requiring identical rules. This framework is developed theoretically in Chapter Five and operationalised through the AGDTA.

3.6.DATA PROTECTION AND THE CHALLENGE OF REGULATORY DIVERGENCE

The fragmentation of global data protection law is, perhaps, the single most significant governance challenge for cross-border digital commerce. Data is the primary input into digital service delivery; its governance determines the conditions under which digital services can be offered across borders; and the current regulatory landscape—with the EU's comprehensive rights-based framework, the US's sector-specific market-oriented approach, China's state-sovereignty model, and the diverse hybrid frameworks of emerging economies—creates compliance complexity that imposes genuine costs and genuine uncertainty.

The GDPR's extraterritorial reach has made it the dominant global standard, but dominant does not mean universal. The CCPA and other US state privacy laws create additional compliance obligations that interact imperfectly with GDPR requirements. Brazil's LGPD, modelled on GDPR but with significant differences, adds another layer. India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023) takes a different approach to several key issues. The result is not a convergence towards a single global standard but a proliferation of standards that are similar enough to be confusingly inconsistent and different enough to require separate compliance programmes.

The OECD's Privacy Guidelines and the APEC Privacy Framework represent attempts to develop interoperability mechanisms that reduce this fragmentation without requiring full harmonisation. These efforts are valuable, and the AGDTA's Abu Dhabi Data Sovereignty Solution, proposed in Chapter Five, builds on their logic by providing trusted technical-legal infrastructure that enables cross-border data utility while satisfying diverse sovereignty requirements.

CHAPTER FOUR: KEY LEGAL CHALLENGES IN CROSS-BORDER E-COMMERCE

The governance of cross-border digital commerce stands at an inflection point. Transnational e-commerce, propelled by technological innovation, global platform economies, and evolving consumer expectations, has created unprecedented economic opportunities alongside legal complexities that existing frameworks are structurally ill-equipped to address. Having practised international commercial law across MENA jurisdictions for over two decades, I have witnessed firsthand how digital transactions routinely transcend multiple regulatory structures, legal traditions, and enforcement regimes—creating governance gaps that undermine commercial predictability and consumer protection alike.

This chapter examines the five core legal challenges arising from cross-border e-commerce: jurisdictional fragmentation, consumer protection deficits, data governance divergence, digital taxation disputes, and inadequate dispute resolution. It introduces two original theoretical contributions—the doctrine of Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus and the theory of Algorithmic Legal Pluralism—that advance the scholarly understanding of these challenges and generate specific governance responses. Throughout, I draw upon developments in the Abu Dhabi Global Market (ADGM) to illustrate how innovative regulatory design can address these challenges in practice.

4.1 JURISDICTION AND APPLICABLE LAW IN DIGITAL TRANSACTIONS

4.1.1. The Borderless Nature of Digital Commerce

Consider a transaction that is, in commercial terms, entirely routine: a consumer in Mumbai purchases software through a platform incorporated in Ireland, operated through servers in Singapore, with payment processed in the United States, and customer support provided from the Philippines. Which jurisdiction's courts have competence to hear a dispute? Which substantive law governs the contract? Which regulatory standards apply to data protection, consumer rights, and taxation?

Traditional jurisdictional doctrines—territoriality, nationality, effects—provide inadequate answers to these questions. The principle of lex loci contractus (law of the place of contracting) becomes incoherent when contract formation occurs through distributed digital infrastructure with no identifiable physical location. The doctrine of lex loci solutionis (law of the place of performance) faces similar difficulties when performance involves digital delivery to anywhere with internet access. Cloud computing, decentralised platforms, and peer-to-peer transactions further compound this uncertainty.

The jurisprudence has struggled to adapt. In the European Union, the Court of Justice has interpreted the Brussels I Regulation to address digital contexts, yet significant ambiguity persists. The targeting doctrine—whereby jurisdiction attaches where a trader directs commercial activities—requires case-by-case assessment of factors such as language, currency, geographic references, and advertising reach. In Pammer v Reederei Karl Schlüter (C-585/08) and Hotel Alpenhof v Heller (C-144/09), the CJEU articulated non-exhaustive criteria, but their application remains unpredictable across member states. The commercial cost of this unpredictability is real: businesses cannot structure their digital operations on the basis of clear jurisdictional rules, because those rules do not exist.

4.1.2. The Limits of Party Autonomy

Party autonomy through choice-of-law and forum selection clauses offers partial solutions. Sophisticated commercial parties routinely specify governing law and exclusive jurisdiction in their agreements, creating contractual certainty that transcends jurisdictional ambiguity. The enforceability of such clauses under the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements (2005) has strengthened their utility in business-to-business transactions.

However, party autonomy encounters significant limitations in consumer contexts. The European Union's Rome I Regulation (Article 6) prevents choice-of-law clauses from depriving consumers of the protection afforded by the mandatory rules of their habitual residence. Similarly, the Brussels I Recast preserves consumer forum rights regardless of contractual provisions. These protective mechanisms, while justifiable from a consumer welfare perspective, create compliance complexity for businesses operating across jurisdictions with varying mandatory rules.

In my experience advising multinationals on MENA e-commerce operations, this regulatory patchwork creates substantial transaction costs. A single platform may face different applicable laws for consumers in the UAE, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Jordan—each with distinct mandatory consumer protection provisions, different approaches to electronic contract validity, and different dispute resolution requirements. The absence of regional harmonisation compounds the challenge that jurisdictional uncertainty creates.

4.1.3. The Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus: An Original Theoretical Contribution

The inadequacy of existing jurisdictional doctrines for digital trade creates a practical governance gap. Businesses cannot plan their operations on the basis of rules that are unclear, and consumers cannot assert their rights through mechanisms that are uncertain. I propose the doctrine of Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus as a theoretical contribution to resolving this gap.

The Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus doctrine reconceptualises territorial jurisdiction for digital contexts by replacing binary presence/absence analysis with a graduated framework based on the intensity and nature of a digital actor's engagement with a jurisdiction. The doctrine identifies three tiers of jurisdictional nexus, each attracting different regulatory competences:

The first tier—intensive digital presence—arises where a digital actor actively and systematically targets a jurisdiction's market, maintains local infrastructure, employs local staff, or holds itself out as operating locally. This tier attracts full regulatory jurisdiction, equivalent to that exercised over physically present entities. It applies to large digital platforms with substantial market presence regardless of formal legal establishment.

The second tier—targeted engagement—arises where a digital actor directs commercial activities towards a jurisdiction's consumers but does not maintain an intensive presence. This tier attracts consumer protection and basic contract enforcement jurisdiction but not the full range of regulatory obligations applicable to locally established entities. It corresponds broadly to the EU's targeting doctrine but provides more precise criteria for determining when targeting has occurred.

The third tier—incidental access—arises where a jurisdiction's consumers access a digital service that was not specifically targeted at their market. This tier attracts no specific regulatory jurisdiction beyond the minimum required to address serious consumer harm, such as fraud or data breach. It recognises that requiring regulatory compliance for every jurisdiction from which a digital service is theoretically accessible would make cross-border digital commerce practically impossible.

The Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus doctrine addresses specific deficiencies in current frameworks: unlike the Zippo active/passive sliding scale test, which was designed for website-specific internet jurisdiction and provides inadequate guidance for complex platform transactions, it provides graduated competence calibrated to the nature of digital engagement. Unlike the EU targeting doctrine, it establishes predictable categories rather than a non-

exhaustive factor analysis. Unlike the effects doctrine, it limits jurisdictional competence based on the nature and intensity of engagement rather than mere impact.

Within the AGDTA framework, the ADGM Digital Trade Tribunal would apply the Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus doctrine as its jurisdictional framework, providing coherent jurisprudence that could be adopted as a model provision in the Digital Trade Code and ultimately submitted to UNCITRAL for consideration as a model law.

4.1.4. ADGM: A Case Study in Jurisdictional Innovation

The Abu Dhabi Global Market offers an instructive case study in how jurisdictional innovation can address the challenges of digital commerce. Established in 2015 as an international financial centre applying English common law within the civil law framework of the UAE, ADGM has developed jurisdictional arrangements that are directly relevant to digital trade.

ADGM's framework allows parties to submit to ADGM Courts jurisdiction by agreement, creating a neutral forum applying familiar common law principles. This is particularly valuable for parties from different legal traditions—a Jordanian company and a South Korean technology provider, for example—who may prefer a common law forum applying internationally recognised principles over the domestic courts of either party's jurisdiction. ADGM Courts have developed fully digital proceedings, remote witness examination, and electronic evidence protocols that address the practical challenges of cross-border digital disputes. Their reciprocal enforcement arrangements with courts in Singapore, the UK, India, and other jurisdictions provide a basis for effective enforcement of judgments across borders—the Achilles heel of international commercial litigation.

ADGM's approach demonstrates that jurisdictional innovation is achievable within a relatively short timeframe when institutional design is purpose-built rather than inherited. The AGDTA builds directly on ADGM's demonstrated capacity.

4.2. CONSUMER PROTECTION IN CROSS-BORDER DIGITAL COMMERCE

Consumer protection in cross-border digital commerce presents a paradox: the very features that make digital commerce attractive to consumers—its convenience, its global reach, its price transparency—also generate the conditions for consumer harm. When a consumer in Amman purchases goods through a Chinese marketplace using a US payment processor, they are exposed to risks that no single national consumer protection framework adequately addresses.

4.2.1. The Structural Asymmetry of Digital Consumer Transactions

The information asymmetry between digital consumers and the businesses they transact with is more acute than in physical commerce. Digital consumers cannot inspect goods before purchase; they often cannot verify the identity or location of the seller; they frequently do not understand the contractual terms embedded in the standard terms and conditions they accept; and they may not be aware of the data collection and processing activities that accompany their transactions. Platform intermediaries add a further layer of complexity: the platform may not be the seller, but it exercises significant influence over the terms on which transactions occur and the mechanisms through which consumers can seek redress.

The enforcement asymmetry is equally significant. A consumer with a small-value cross-border dispute faces prohibitive costs of pursuing their claim through formal legal channels—particularly where the seller is located in a different jurisdiction, the applicable law is uncertain, and no effective online dispute resolution mechanism is available. This enforcement asymmetry creates incentives for businesses to underprice consumer rights: the rational expectation that most consumers will not pursue small-value claims allows businesses to maintain practices that cause aggregate harm even when individual harms are modest.

4.2.2. The Fragmented Regulatory Landscape

Consumer protection in e-commerce is regulated through a combination of national legislation, regional frameworks, and platform-specific policies. The quality and coverage of these mechanisms varies dramatically across jurisdictions.

The EU's Consumer Rights Directive (2011) and the more recent Digital Services Act (2022) provide a comprehensive framework for consumer protection in digital markets, including pre-contractual information requirements, cancellation rights, platform transparency obligations, and mechanisms for consumer redress. The EU framework is the most comprehensive in the world, but its applicability to transactions involving non-EU sellers is limited—it creates rights that EU consumers hold against non-EU businesses, but the enforcement of those rights across jurisdictions is uncertain.

Outside the EU, consumer protection frameworks for e-commerce are weaker and more variable. The US Federal Trade Commission enforces consumer protection laws against deceptive and unfair practices, but its jurisdiction is primarily domestic. Developing countries vary widely in their consumer protection capacity—some, like Brazil and India, have relatively robust frameworks; others have minimal protection for digital consumers.

The resulting consumer protection landscape is one in which the quality of protection available to a consumer depends primarily on where they are located rather than on any consistent standard. This is normatively unacceptable and commercially damaging—the confidence in digital commerce that drives its expansion depends on consumers trusting that their rights will be respected regardless of where the seller is located.

4.2.3. Platform Liability: The Unresolved Question

The question of platform liability—to what extent an intermediary platform is responsible for the conduct of the sellers using its marketplace—is one of the most contested in digital commerce law, and the divergence of national approaches creates significant governance complexity.

The EU's evolving framework, culminating in the Digital Services Act, imposes extensive due diligence obligations on large platforms and holds them liable for certain failures of oversight. The US approach, grounded in Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, provides broad immunity for platforms from liability for user-generated content—an immunity that has been both celebrated as enabling the development of the internet economy and criticised as shielding platforms from responsibility for harms they could reasonably prevent.

The divergence between EU and US approaches creates compliance challenges for global platforms and regulatory arbitrage opportunities for platforms that structure their operations to minimise liability exposure. The case for a more coherent international standard on platform liability—one that balances the legitimate interests of innovation, consumer protection, and competitive equality—is strong. The AGDTA's Digital Trade Code addresses this through its Platform Commerce book, which establishes platform operator duties and liability allocation principles grounded in the Digital Trade Constitutionalism framework.

4.3. DATA GOVERNANCE AND THE PRIVACY ARCHITECTURE

The governance of data in cross-border digital commerce involves three distinct but interrelated challenges: the protection of personal data from misuse, the facilitation of legitimate cross-border data flows necessary for digital service delivery, and the resolution of the tension between national data sovereignty and the free flow of data that the internet economy requires.

4.3.1. The GDPR as a Global Standard

The EU General Data Protection Regulation has become, through its extraterritorial reach and adequacy decision mechanism, the de facto global baseline for personal data protection. Its extraterritorial application—to any organisation processing the personal data of EU residents, regardless of where that organisation is located—has created a situation in which compliance with GDPR is effectively mandatory for any company operating at global scale.

GDPR's influence on non-EU jurisdictions has been substantial. Brazil's LGPD, South Korea's PIPA, India's DPDP Act, and numerous others draw significantly on GDPR's framework of individual rights, controller obligations, and supervisory authority oversight. This convergence is valuable—it reduces cross-border compliance complexity for companies operating in multiple jurisdictions and it raises global data protection standards.

But GDPR compliance imposes significant costs, particularly on smaller businesses and businesses in developing countries. The documentation requirements, the appointment of data protection officers, the conduct of data protection impact assessments, and the management of data subject rights are all resource-intensive activities. The GDPR was designed for organisations with substantial compliance capacity; its effective global imposition through the extraterritoriality mechanism treats all organisations as if they have that capacity, regardless of where they are located or what resources they command.

4.3.2. The Data Localisation Debate

The proliferation of data localisation requirements—mandating that certain categories of data be stored and processed within a country's territory—represents one of the most significant barriers to cross-border digital commerce. Data localisation requirements have been introduced, in various forms, by China, Russia, India (for financial data), Indonesia, Vietnam, Nigeria, and others. They are justified on grounds of national security, privacy protection, and regulatory oversight. They are opposed, primarily by the US and EU digital industry, as arbitrary barriers to trade.

The reality is more nuanced than either position acknowledges. Some data localisation requirements are genuinely motivated by legitimate security and privacy concerns—a government may have legitimate reasons to require that its citizens' health records be stored in a jurisdiction where they are subject to national regulatory oversight. Others are primarily protectionist in motivation, designed to favour domestic digital infrastructure providers. The challenge for a governance framework is to distinguish between legitimate and protectionist localisation requirements—a task that existing WTO disciplines, with their vague public policy exceptions, perform poorly.

The AGDTA's Abu Dhabi Data Sovereignty Solution, developed in Chapter Five, addresses this challenge through a technical-legal framework that enables cross-border data utility while satisfying legitimate sovereignty requirements—providing a neutral trusted infrastructure that substitutes for territorial control without requiring abandonment of sovereignty concerns.

4.3.3. Algorithmic legal pluralism: an original theoretical contribution

The analysis of data governance in digital commerce reveals a challenge that existing legal frameworks are not equipped to address: the emergence of algorithmic systems as autonomous normative orders that govern commercial transactions independently of and often in preference to national law.

I propose the theory of Algorithmic Legal Pluralism as a theoretical contribution to understanding this challenge. The theory builds upon and extends Gunther Teubner's concept of lex digitalis—the emergence of private ordering through digital systems—by recognising algorithmic governance not merely as private ordering but as an autonomous normative system with emergent properties: rules arising from the interaction of code, data, and the commercial environment in which the algorithm operates; automatic enforcement upon code execution; and legitimacy claims based on technical objectivity and systemic efficiency. The distinction from Teubner's account is deliberate and substantive. Teubner identifies lex digitalis as a form of private ordering that operates alongside law but remains ultimately subject to it. Algorithmic Legal Pluralism goes further: it recognises that algorithmic systems do not merely supplement legal governance but increasingly displace it in practice, operating with a speed, scale, and opacity that renders traditional legal oversight structurally inadequate. The governance challenge is not to accommodate algorithmic ordering within existing legal categories—Teubner's project—but to develop new institutional competencies capable of engaging with algorithmic systems on their own terms.

The theory's key propositions are three. First, the algorithmic normativity thesis: algorithmic systems governing commercial transactions are normative orders, not merely technical tools. They determine what is permissible, what is rewarded, and what is penalised in the commercial environments they govern—functions that are indistinguishable in their effects from legal norms. A platform's algorithm that determines which sellers are displayed to consumers, in what order, and on what terms, governs the commercial life chances of those sellers with an immediacy and totality that few legal rules achieve.

Second, interlegality 2.0: the interaction between algorithmic governance and traditional legal orders is not a simple hierarchy in which law overrides code, but a complex interpenetration in which each system shapes the other. Law constrains the design of algorithms—through consumer protection requirements, competition law, data protection obligations. But algorithms shape the practical application of legal rights—by determining whether consumers

can practically exercise their right to information, whether sellers can practically contest platform decisions, whether contractual terms are practically enforceable. The two systems co-exist in a state of ongoing tension and mutual influence.

Third, the translation problem: many fundamental legal concepts resist translation into algorithmic form. Reasonableness, good faith, materiality, proportionality—these concepts require contextual judgment that algorithms can approximate but not replicate. Where legal obligations expressed through such concepts are translated into algorithmic implementation, information is inevitably lost, and the resulting governance may satisfy the letter of legal requirements while violating their spirit.

The practical implication of Algorithmic Legal Pluralism is that governance responses to digital commerce must address algorithmic ordering as a normative system in its own right, requiring its own institutional competencies, doctrinal tools, and remedial mechanisms. The AGDTA's Code-Native Arbitrator concept—arbitrators who are trained in both law and code—and its Digital Trade Constitutionalism framework, which binds both public and private governance actors including platform algorithms, operationalise this insight.

4.4. DIGITAL TAXATION AND THE JURISDICTIONAL IMPASSE

The taxation of digital commerce represents one of the clearest examples of the structural mismatch between existing legal frameworks and digital realities. Traditional international tax law is built on the permanent establishment concept—a company is taxable in a jurisdiction where it has a fixed place of business through which it carries on its activities. Digital businesses can generate enormous revenue in a jurisdiction without any physical establishment, making the permanent establishment concept both practically inadequate and strategically exploitable.

The OECD's BEPS project and the Two-Pillar Solution represent the most significant attempt to resolve this mismatch. Pillar One would reallocate a portion of the profits of the largest and most profitable multinationals to market jurisdictions—the countries where their users and customers are located—regardless of physical presence. Pillar Two would establish a global minimum corporate tax of fifteen percent, reducing the incentive for profit-shifting to low-tax jurisdictions.

The Two-Pillar Solution, announced with considerable fanfare in 2021, has proven more difficult to implement than anticipated. Pillar Two has progressed—most OECD members have implemented or are implementing the global minimum tax. Pillar One has stalled, primarily due to US resistance to the reallocation mechanism, which US technology companies and their Congressional allies have opposed as unfairly targeting the US digital industry.

The result is a continuing proliferation of unilateral Digital Services Taxes—France, Italy, Spain, the UK, India, and others have all introduced or maintained DSTs in the absence of the multilateral solution—creating precisely the fragmentation that the BEPS process was designed to prevent. A US-incorporated digital company serving markets in all of these jurisdictions faces a patchwork of DST regimes, each with different rates, thresholds, and covered services, that creates compliance costs and competitive distortions.

The AGDTA's Digital Trade Code, described in Chapter Five, includes provisions on digital trade taxation that draw on the Two-Pillar framework while providing more detailed implementation guidance. The AGDTA's regulatory convergence initiative creates a mechanism for participating jurisdictions to coordinate their digital taxation approaches, reducing the fragmentation that unilateral action creates.

4.5. DISPUTE RESOLUTION: THE SYSTEMIC FAILURE

The dispute resolution mechanisms available to parties in cross-border digital commerce disputes are, in aggregate, systemically inadequate. This is not a peripheral problem—it is central to the governance deficit this thesis addresses. Rights without effective remedies are not rights in any commercially meaningful sense. Consumer protection provisions that cannot be enforced against non-resident sellers; data protection obligations that cannot be vindicated through accessible dispute resolution; contractual rights that can only be asserted through expensive international litigation—these are governance failures with real commercial and human costs.

4.5.1. The Inadequacy of Traditional Litigation

Traditional litigation is poorly suited to most cross-border digital disputes, for reasons that are structural rather than contingent. The costs of international litigation are prohibitive relative to the value of most individual digital transactions. The complexity of conflict-of-laws analysis—which law governs, which court has jurisdiction, which enforcement mechanisms are available—imposes uncertainty and delay that rational litigants will rarely accept for small-value claims. The recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments is governed by a patchwork of bilateral treaties and domestic rules that provides limited certainty.

Even for large commercial disputes, traditional litigation faces challenges in the digital context. The evidentiary challenges of digital evidence—authenticity, integrity, admissibility across different evidentiary standards—are significant. The technical complexity of many digital commerce disputes—concerning algorithmic decisions, smart contract execution, platform governance choices—requires judicial expertise that generalist courts often lack.

4.5.2. International Arbitration: Potential and Limitations

International arbitration offers important advantages over litigation for cross-border digital commercial disputes: party autonomy in selecting arbitrators and applicable rules, confidentiality, and enforcement through the New York Convention (1958), which provides for the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards in over 170 countries. Major arbitral institutions—the ICC, SIAC, LCIA—have developed significant expertise in complex commercial disputes and have adapted their procedures to address digital dimensions of cases.

But existing arbitral institutions have limitations in the digital commerce context. They were designed primarily for large-value B2B disputes and their procedures and cost structures are poorly suited to the high volume, lower value disputes that characterise much of digital commerce. The absence of specialised expertise in the technical dimensions of digital disputes—smart contracts, algorithmic decision-making, platform governance—means that arbitral proceedings often require extensive expert evidence that adds cost and delay. And arbitral awards, while widely enforceable through the New York Convention, face enforcement challenges against assets held in jurisdictions where enforcement is practically difficult.

4.5.3. **Online Dispute Resolution: Progress and Gaps**

Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) mechanisms—platforms that enable parties to file claims, exchange evidence, and participate in mediation or arbitration without physical attendance—have developed significantly over the past decade and represent the most promising avenue for addressing the high-volume, low-value consumer disputes that digital commerce generates.

The EU's ODR platform, the UNCITRAL technical notes on ODR, and the private ODR services offered by major e-commerce platforms represent significant progress. But existing ODR mechanisms have important limitations: their coverage is fragmented; their outcomes lack the enforceability of arbitral awards; their design often reflects the interests of platforms rather than consumers; and their capacity to address technically complex disputes is limited.

The AGDTA's three-track dispute resolution system—combining the ADGM Digital Trade Tribunal for complex precedent-setting cases, the Global Digital Arbitration Centre for commercial disputes across a range of values, and integrated ODR for consumer disputes—is designed to address these limitations comprehensively. It is described in detail in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND THE ABU DHABI GLOBAL DIGITAL TRADE ARCHITECTURE

Having identified the core governance deficits in international digital trade law and developed the theoretical frameworks necessary to address them, this chapter undertakes two tasks. First, it presents the comparative analysis of major jurisdictional approaches—EU, US, and Asian—that the research questions require, identifying structural patterns in the governance gaps that no single jurisdiction has resolved. Second, and centrally, it proposes the Abu Dhabi Global Digital Trade Architecture (AGDTA): a comprehensive, seven-pillar institutional framework designed to address those gaps through a combination of original theoretical contributions and grounded institutional design.

5.1.COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: EU, US, AND ASIAN APPROACHES

5.1.1. The European Union: Comprehensive Regulation and Extraterritorial Reach

The EU's approach to digital trade governance is characterised by three features that distinguish it from all other major jurisdictions: comprehensiveness, rights-orientation, and extraterritorial ambition. Its data protection framework (GDPR), platform regulation (DSA and DMA), competition law application to digital markets, and consumer protection framework collectively constitute the most complete regulatory architecture for digital commerce in the world.

The GDPR has effectively set a global minimum standard for personal data protection through its extraterritorial application and adequacy decision mechanism. The DSA and DMA represent a new generation of platform regulation that goes significantly further than any comparable US framework, imposing due diligence obligations on large platforms, requiring algorithmic transparency, and constraining the self-preferencing behaviour of digital gatekeepers.

The EU's strengths are, simultaneously, its limitations as a model for global governance. Its regulatory architecture requires significant compliance capacity that most non-EU jurisdictions lack. Its enforcement mechanisms—the European Data Protection Board, the European Commission's DMA enforcement powers—are not replicable at global scale without a comparable institutional framework. Its adequacy decision process gives the EU significant leverage over third-country regulatory choices, but this leverage is a source of political tension rather than consensual governance.

Most fundamentally, the EU's approach to digital governance is premised on a specific set of values—individual privacy as a fundamental right, state regulatory capacity as a public good, platform accountability as a democratic necessity—that are not universally shared. A global governance framework cannot be built on the EU model alone without requiring other jurisdictions to adopt those values, which the history of international trade governance suggests is not a realistic prospect.

5.1.2. **The United States: Market-Orientation and Institutional Fragmentation**

The US approach to digital governance is characterised by reliance on market mechanisms, sector-specific regulation, and strong private sector self-governance. It has produced the most dynamic and innovative digital economy in the world. It has also produced the most significant concentration of digital market power, the most exploitative data practices at scale, and the most substantial resistance to effective consumer protection in digital markets.

The US's institutional fragmentation—different agencies regulate different aspects of digital commerce, with the FTC's consumer protection role, the FCC's communications regulation, the SEC's financial markets oversight, and state-level privacy and consumer protection laws operating in complex and sometimes conflicting ways—creates governance inconsistency that imposes compliance costs and creates arbitrage opportunities for well-resourced actors.

The US's engagement with international digital trade governance has been shaped primarily by the interests of its dominant digital industry—the large technology platforms, cloud computing providers, and digital service companies whose commercial success depends on the free flow of data across borders and the minimisation of regulatory constraints. This has made the US an advocate for digital trade liberalisation and an opponent of regulatory approaches, such as the EU's, that constrain the commercial freedom of digital businesses.

The US approach has substantial merits: it has enabled innovation, maintained dynamic competition in some digital markets, and produced digital services that consumers globally have found valuable. Its limitation as a global governance model is that it works best for large, well-resourced actors and is poorly suited to the protection of consumers, small businesses, and developing country participants in the digital economy.

5.1.3. **Asian Approaches: Diversity and Digital Sovereignty**

The Asian region encompasses the most significant diversity of digital governance approaches in the world. China's comprehensive state-sovereignty model, Singapore's pragmatic facilitation approach, Japan's balanced consumer-protection framework, India's emerging comprehensive data protection regime, and the diverse ASEAN members' varying approaches represent almost the full range of possible regulatory orientations.

Singapore deserves particular attention for this thesis's purposes. Its approach to digital governance—pragmatic, institution-building, internationally oriented, and innovation-friendly—provides a direct model for aspects of the AGDTA proposal. Singapore's emergence as a leading international arbitration centre, its development of regulatory sandboxes for fintech innovation, and its digital economy agreements with New Zealand, Chile, and Australia (DEPA) demonstrate that a small jurisdiction with strong institutions and clear strategic vision can exercise disproportionate influence on the development of digital trade governance.

China's model, by contrast, represents the most significant challenge to any global digital governance framework. Its combination of comprehensive domestic regulation, extraterritorial reach through the requirements imposed on companies operating in China, and active promotion of its governance model through the Belt and Road Digital Silk Road creates a competing governance ecosystem that does not easily integrate with frameworks built on the EU or US model. The AGDTA's variable geometry participation model, which allows different states to pool different competences, is designed in part to accommodate this diversity.

5.1.4. **Structural Gaps No Jurisdiction Has Resolved**

The comparative analysis reveals that each major jurisdiction has addressed some dimensions of digital trade governance effectively but that no jurisdiction—and no combination of existing bilateral or regional frameworks—has resolved the structural governance challenges identified in Chapter Four. The jurisdictional fragmentation problem persists because each jurisdiction applies its own rules without a coherent mechanism for resolving cross-jurisdictional conflicts. The consumer protection deficit persists because protection depends on where a consumer is located rather than on any consistent standard. The data governance fragmentation persists because the three major models are architecturally incompatible and no mechanism for functional interoperability exists. The taxation dispute persists because multilateral agreement has proven unachievable. The dispute resolution inadequacy persists because no institution provides the combination of expertise, accessibility, and enforceability that cross-border digital disputes require.

These structural gaps are not accidents. They are the product of a governance architecture designed for a different era of commerce, applied—imperfectly and incompletely—to a commercial reality it was not designed to address. The AGDTA is designed to address these structural gaps directly.

5.2.THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE AGDTA

5.2.1. **Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling**

The foundational theoretical contribution underlying the AGDTA is the concept of Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling—a model for transnational governance that transcends the binary choice between full harmonisation and continued fragmentation that has paralysed international digital trade negotiations.

The existing literature on international governance offers three primary models for transnational regulatory coordination. Supranationalism, exemplified by the EU, involves the transfer of sovereignty to supranational institutions—states cede regulatory authority in specified domains to bodies that exercise it independently of national governments. This model is politically unavailable at global scale; the political prerequisites for sovereignty transfer of the kind that EU membership requires do not exist in the broader international community.

Treaty coordination involves the creation of binding international obligations through treaty, without the transfer of sovereignty to supranational institutions. This is the WTO model. It has proven valuable in reducing tariffs and certain non-tariff barriers but has shown its limits in the digital governance context, where the issues in contention—data governance models, platform regulation, digital sovereignty—reflect fundamental value differences rather than merely different commercial preferences.

Regulatory networks involve informal coordination among national regulators through information sharing, peer review, and the development of non-binding standards. The International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO), the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), and the Basel Committee provide examples in the financial sector. These networks are valuable but limited—they lack binding authority, implementation infrastructure, and enforcement capacity. The gap between what these three models provide and what digital trade governance requires is the precise space that Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling is designed to occupy. It is not supranationalism because it requires no sovereignty transfer and no constitutional architecture. It is not treaty coordination because it creates institutional capacity rather than merely obligations. And it is not a regulatory network because its outputs are binding within the scope of pooled competences rather than merely persuasive. What distinguishes it is the combination of voluntary participation, variable geometry, and institutional capacity—none of which existing models provide simultaneously.

Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling is theoretically distinct from all three models. It preserves formal state sovereignty—participating states retain their sovereign authority to regulate their own digital environments. But it delegates specific governance competences to shared institutions through voluntary agreements that can be calibrated differently for different competences. A state might pool its dispute resolution competence by submitting its digital trade disputes to the ADGM Digital Trade Tribunal while retaining its data protection competence by applying its own data protection rules. Another state might pool both competences. The variable geometry of participation allows different combinations of competence pooling, maximising the governance benefits of coordination while minimising the sovereignty costs.

The key mechanisms of Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling are three. Variable geometry participation allows states to pool different competences at different levels, creating a flexible architecture that accommodates regulatory diversity while enabling coordination. Functional equivalence recognition enables participating institutions to acknowledge that different regulatory approaches achieve equivalent governance outcomes—so that a business complying with ADGM data protection standards is treated as complying with GDPR-equivalent requirements, without requiring identical rules. Subsidiarity constraints limit the pooling of competences to those domains where coordination provides clear benefits that exceed the sovereignty costs—ensuring that the framework does not expand beyond what participating states have agreed to.

5.2.2. **Digital Trade Constitutionalism**

The second foundational theoretical contribution is Digital Trade Constitutionalism—a framework of fundamental principles that binds both states and private actors exercising governance functions in digital commerce.

The extension of constitutionalism to trade governance is not new—scholars including Petersmann, Cottier, and Howse have developed trade constitutionalism as a framework for understanding the relationship between WTO obligations and fundamental rights. Digital Trade Constitutionalism extends this framework from state-to-state relations to the private governance reality of digital commerce, where platforms, standard-setters, and dispute resolution providers exercise powers that are functionally comparable to state regulation.

The constitutional principles that form the foundation of the AGDTA framework are seven:

Digital Due Process: parties affected by digital governance decisions—platform moderation, algorithmic ranking, automated contract enforcement—have the right to notice of adverse decisions, an explanation of their basis, and access to a meaningful review mechanism.

Data Dignity: individuals have fundamental rights over their personal data that constitute a floor below which no governance framework may descend, regardless of commercial or national security justifications.

Algorithmic Transparency: algorithms exercising significant governance functions in commercial contexts must be subject to appropriate transparency and accountability obligations, including audit rights and explainability requirements.

Platform Neutrality: platforms providing essential commercial infrastructure owe non-discrimination duties to the commercial actors that depend on them; self-preferencing and arbitrary exclusion are constitutionally suspect.

Digital Access: access to digital commerce infrastructure is a prerequisite for economic participation in the contemporary economy; neither states nor private actors may arbitrarily exclude persons from that infrastructure.

Regulatory Legitimacy: private governance of digital commerce—whether by platforms, standard-setters, or dispute resolution bodies—must meet minimum legitimacy requirements: stakeholder participation, reasoned decision-making, and accountability mechanisms.

Jurisdictional Proportionality: state regulatory authority must be proportionate to the nexus between the regulated activity and the legitimate interests of the regulating state; extraterritorial application requires genuine justification beyond mere commercial impact.

These principles provide the normative foundation for AGDTA institutional design. They establish a hierarchy within the AGDTA framework: the Digital Trade Code and ADTT jurisprudence must be interpreted consistently with them, and they take precedence over the specific provisions of any particular pillar where conflict arises.

5.3.THE ABU DHABI GLOBAL DIGITAL TRADE ARCHITECTURE

The Abu Dhabi Global Digital Trade Architecture is a comprehensive institutional framework designed to operationalise the theoretical contributions of Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling and Digital Trade Constitutionalism through seven integrated institutional pillars. Each pillar addresses specific governance gaps identified in the preceding analysis, and the pillars are designed to create synergies rather than simply to accumulate independently useful institutions.

The AGDTA is not incremental reform of existing frameworks. It is a comprehensive reimagining of how international digital trade governance should be organised—built on the demonstrated institutional capacity of ADGM and the strategic positioning of Abu Dhabi as a jurisdiction uniquely placed to host such an institution.

5.3.1. The Case for Abu Dhabi

The choice of Abu Dhabi as the home of the AGDTA is deliberate and requires explicit justification. The objection that major international governance institutions are hosted in The Hague, Geneva, New York, and London—jurisdictions with centuries of legal tradition—is understandable but ultimately unpersuasive.

ADGM's track record since 2015 refutes the premise that institutional legitimacy requires historical longevity. ADGM Courts have adjudicated complex commercial disputes across financial services, technology, and real estate sectors, developing a body of case law that has attracted major international financial institutions and commercial parties who have voluntarily chosen ADGM jurisdiction over the established alternatives of London and Singapore. By 2023, ADGM had registered over 5,000 entities and grown its financial services and technology ecosystem to a scale that established it as one of the fastest-growing international financial centres in the world. ADGM's regulatory sandbox, the RegLab, has hosted over fifty FinTech and digital innovation participants, generating regulatory learning directly applicable to the AGDTA's Innovation Sandbox design. The comparison with Singapore International Arbitration Centre is instructive on the question of institutional maturation: SIAC was established in 1991 and achieved its current position as Asia's leading arbitral institution over roughly fifteen years of deliberate institutional development. ADGM has achieved comparable commercial credibility in a shorter period, suggesting that purpose-built institutional design, backed by sovereign resources and strategic vision, can compress the timeline that legacy institutions required. ADGM's regulatory framework has developed genuine expertise in financial services, FinTech, and digital commerce. Its poly-legal environment—applying

English common law within a civil law federation, in a jurisdiction with significant Islamic finance expertise—provides a structural advantage for the poly-legal adjudication model that the AGDTA's Tribunal would employ, and one that no legacy jurisdiction replicates.

Abu Dhabi's strategic positioning is equally significant. It bridges the world's major trading regions—MENA, Asia, Europe, and Africa—in a way that no single legacy jurisdiction does. Its non-colonial legacy addresses a significant source of legitimacy concern about institutions hosted in former imperial powers. Its sovereign wealth resources provide a funding base that more constrained jurisdictions cannot match. And its demonstrated willingness to invest in institutional innovation—ADGM, the UAE's digital economy strategy, Abu Dhabi's recent investments in technology governance—provides a credible foundation for AGDTA's development.

The comparison with Singapore is instructive. Singapore emerged as the leading international arbitration centre in Asia within a relatively short period, not through historical legacy but through institutional quality, strategic investment, and clear vision. The AGDTA replicates this model at a different scale and with a different mandate.

5.3.2. Pillar I: The ADGM Digital Trade Tribunal (ADTT)

The ADGM Digital Trade Tribunal is a standing international commercial tribunal with compulsory jurisdiction over digital trade disputes where parties have elected AGDTA governance, or where participating states have pooled their adjudicative competence. Unlike ad hoc arbitration, the ADTT develops coherent jurisprudence through a system of precedent—building the body of digital trade law that currently does not exist.

The Poly-Legal Adjudication Model is the ADTT's most distinctive institutional feature and its most significant theoretical contribution to international dispute resolution. Each panel comprises three judges representing different legal traditions—common law, civil law, and Islamic law where parties or subject matter warrant. This tri-traditional composition achieves several objectives simultaneously: legitimacy enhancement, because parties see their legal tradition represented; interpretive accuracy, because law is interpreted by those trained in its methodology; and Global South inclusion, because non-Western legal traditions are institutionally represented rather than merely accommodated.

The Technical Assessor System complements the poly-legal bench by incorporating blockchain engineers, AI specialists, and cybersecurity experts as non-voting panel members assisting on technical questions. This directly addresses the battle-of-experts problem that afflicts technology litigation in existing courts and arbitral tribunals, and it operationalises the Algorithmic Legal Pluralism theory by ensuring that algorithmic governance is understood on its own terms rather than forced into traditional legal categories.

Parties may elect governing law from a curated menu: UNCITRAL instruments, EU digital acquis, US UCC/UETA framework, or the AGDTA Digital Trade Code. The ADTT applies the chosen law using judges trained in that tradition—providing the predictable interpretation that is unavailable when foreign law is applied by judges unfamiliar with its methodology.

ADTT judgments are enforceable through a new multilateral instrument, the Abu Dhabi Convention on Digital Trade Judgments; through ADGM's existing bilateral recognition network; and through reciprocal arrangements with national courts in participating jurisdictions. The Abu Dhabi Convention includes novel provisions for digital asset attachment, platform enforcement cooperation, and smart contract execution—mechanisms that are unavailable under existing instruments.

5.3.3. **Pillar II: The Global Digital Arbitration Centre (GDAC)**

The Global Digital Arbitration Centre provides flexible, efficient party-driven dispute resolution for digital trade disputes of all sizes, complementing the ADTT's precedent-development function with a three-track system calibrated to dispute value and complexity.

The Code-Native Arbitrator panel is the GDAC's most distinctive feature. Certification through the AGDTA Academy requires both legal qualification and demonstrated technical competence in smart contract code interpretation, distributed ledger technology, and AI system assessment. This creates a new professional category of practitioner equally conversant in law and code—a category that the existing arbitral market cannot supply at scale but that the GDAC's certification programme would develop.

The three-track system addresses the full range of digital commerce disputes. The Express Track handles disputes under USD 50,000 through a single arbitrator with a 45-day resolution target and capped fees—making arbitration economically viable for the SME disputes that currently have no effective remedy. The Standard Track addresses disputes between USD 50,000 and USD 5 million through conventional procedure with digital-first processes. The Complex Track handles disputes over USD 5 million or involving novel legal questions through an expanded procedure with technical assessors and potential ADTT referral for precedent-setting issues.

Smart contract integration allows awards to be rendered as executable smart contracts where parties have compatible blockchain assets, enabling automated enforcement without traditional execution procedures. This directly addresses the last-mile enforcement problem—the practical difficulty of enforcing awards against parties who are able and willing to resist execution.

5.3.4. **Pillar III: The Digital Trade Regulatory Convergence Initiative (DTRCI)**

The Digital Trade Regulatory Convergence Initiative operationalises Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling by creating pathways for functional equivalence recognition among participating jurisdictions without requiring full regulatory harmonisation.

The Equivalence Assessment Framework provides a systematic methodology for assessing whether different regulatory approaches achieve equivalent governance outcomes. Where ADGM data protection standards and the GDPR achieve equivalent consumer data protection outcomes through different mechanisms, the DTRCI would issue a formal equivalence recognition enabling data flows between the two frameworks. This replicates and extends the EU's adequacy decision mechanism in a multilateral, non-hierarchical format—no single jurisdiction's regulatory framework is treated as the standard against which others are assessed.

The Regulatory Passport System allows entities certified under AGDTA standards to operate across participating jurisdictions through notification rather than separate licensing. This modular compliance architecture—one certification framework, multiple market access—directly reduces the duplication that multi-jurisdictional digital commerce currently requires and is the most concrete practical benefit that AGDTA participation would offer to businesses.

5.3.5. **Pillar IV: The Abu Dhabi Data Sovereignty Solution (ADSS)**

The Abu Dhabi Data Sovereignty Solution addresses what is perhaps the most technically intractable governance challenge in digital trade: the tension between data localisation requirements, which reflect legitimate sovereignty concerns, and cross-border data flows, which are necessary for digital service delivery.

The ADSS provides trusted technical-legal infrastructure that enables cross-border data utility while satisfying diverse sovereignty requirements. Its federated technical architecture uses privacy-enhancing technologies—federated learning, secure multi-party computation, homomorphic encryption—to enable data to remain physically in the jurisdiction of origin while allowing the insights and analytics derived from that data to cross borders. This resolves the fundamental technical premise of data localisation requirements: that data must be physically present in a jurisdiction to be subject to its regulatory oversight.

The Sovereign Data Trust structure applies trust law principles in an unprecedented context. ADGM-registered Data Trust Companies serve as neutral fiduciaries for cross-border data arrangements, owing duties to data subjects as beneficiaries regardless of nationality. Participating states define permitted uses through trust instruments, maintaining sovereign authority over their citizens' data while enabling cross-border commercial use. This structure provides the governance accountability that purely contractual data transfer arrangements lack.

The Multi-Framework Compliance Engine provides automated compliance verification against multiple data protection frameworks simultaneously—GDPR, CCPA, India's DPDP Act, and others—reducing the compliance cost of multi-jurisdictional data governance to a manageable overhead rather than a prohibitive burden.

5.3.6. **Pillar V: The AGDTA Digital Trade Code**

The AGDTA Digital Trade Code is the most ambitious of the seven pillars: a comprehensive codification of digital trade law designed not to adapt existing instruments but to provide purpose-built substantive law for digital commerce. Parties may elect the Code as governing law, with ADTT interpretation, providing the legal certainty that existing frameworks cannot supply.

The Code is organised in five Books. Book I on Digital Contract Formation addresses electronic offer and acceptance, smart contract formation, AI-agent contracting, and automated decision-making in performance. It introduces original doctrines that have no equivalent in existing commercial law: the AI Agency Attribution rules, which establish when commercial acts of an AI agent bind its principal; the Algorithmic Mistake doctrine, which extends the law of mistake to contracts entered into through algorithmic processes operating outside their intended parameters; and Smart Contract Rectification procedures, which allow courts and tribunals to correct smart contracts that fail to give effect to the parties' actual agreement.

Book II on Digital Goods and Services establishes classification standards for digital products, quality standards for software and data, warranties for algorithmic services, and remedies for digital defects—filling the gap that existing goods-oriented commercial law leaves in the digital services context.

Book III on Platform Commerce establishes platform operator duties, liability allocation in triangular platform relationships, and consumer protection standards in marketplace transactions. Its Platform Due Process Rules operationalise the Digital Due Process principle, requiring platforms to provide notice, explanation, and review mechanisms for adverse decisions affecting commercial users.

Book IV on Data as a Commercial Asset establishes property-like rights in data, data licensing frameworks, breach remedies, and portability obligations in commercial contexts. Its most innovative provision is the Data-as-Consideration doctrine, which recognises personal data as legally valid contract consideration—giving formal legal recognition to the reality that most digital consumer transactions involve an exchange of data for services.

Book V on Digital Trade Finance addresses electronic documents of title, tokenised trade instruments, blockchain letters of credit, and digital payment obligations—providing the

commercial law infrastructure for the digitisation of trade finance that is proceeding without adequate legal underpinning.

5.3.7. **Pillar VI: The AGDTA Academy**

The AGDTA Academy provides the human capital infrastructure that the AGDTA requires. Its programmes include an Executive LLM in Digital Trade Law, developed in partnership with leading universities; a Judicial Training Programme placing sitting judges on secondment at the ADTT; the Code-Native Arbitrator Certification programme; and the Global South Fellowship, providing fully funded positions for legal professionals from developing economies.

The Academy's research function is equally important. Permanent staff produce model laws, regulatory guidance, and scholarly commentary; serve as the secretariat for Digital Trade Code drafting and revision; and publish an annual State of Digital Trade Law report submitted to UNCITRAL and the WTO. This positions the AGDTA as the primary institutional resource for international digital trade law scholarship, complementing its dispute resolution and regulatory coordination functions.

5.3.8. **Pillar VII: The Digital Trade Innovation Sandbox**

The Digital Trade Innovation Sandbox provides a structured environment for testing innovative digital trade business models under modified regulatory conditions, feeding both AGDTA framework development and recommendations to global standard-setters.

The Sandbox operates through mutual recognition agreements with the regulatory sandbox programmes of Singapore (MAS), the UK (FCA), and Australia (ASIC), enabling cross-border testing of innovations across multiple jurisdictions simultaneously. A FinTech innovation can be tested in the Abu Dhabi and Singapore regulatory environments concurrently, generating regulatory learning for both jurisdictions while providing certainty to innovators about their compliance obligations during the testing period.

The Sandbox's scope covers the frontier of digital commerce governance: tokenised trade finance instruments, AI-autonomous commercial agents, decentralised marketplace governance, cross-border data trust structures, algorithmic pricing mechanisms, and digital identity for cross-border commerce. These are the governance challenges that existing frameworks cannot yet address—and the Sandbox is designed to generate the evidence base for addressing them.

5.4.GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTATION

5.4.1. **Institutional Governance**

The AGDTA's governance structure is designed to embody the legitimacy principles it promotes. The AGDTA Council (Strategic Oversight) comprises fifteen members—five government representatives rotating among participating states, five private sector representatives, and five civil society members. The Council's composition ensures that no single stakeholder group can capture the institution's strategic direction.

The Executive Directorate manages day-to-day operations under a Director-General appointed by the Council for a five-year renewable term. Pillar Directors, appointed by the DG with Council approval, bring relevant expertise in dispute resolution, regulatory convergence, data governance, legal codification, education, and innovation. The Stakeholder Assembly provides an open forum for registered stakeholders—states, businesses, NGOs, academics, professional associations—with an advisory function and the power to nominate civil society Council members.

The Judicial Appointments Commission, composed of senior jurists nominated by international judicial bodies, is responsible for ADTT judge appointment and discipline. The Commission's independence from political interference is the most critical governance design feature: the ADTT's legitimacy depends on the credibility of its adjudication, which in turn depends on the independence of its judges.

5.4.2. **Global South Inclusion**

The Global South inclusion question deserves more than structural description. A legitimate concern—and one that any serious examiner of international institutional design will raise—is whether the AGDTA risks replicating the pattern that has characterised many international economic institutions: formal inclusion mechanisms that are overridden in practice by the weight of resources, expertise, and agenda-setting capacity concentrated in developed economy participants. The WTO's developing country provisions, the IMF's voting structure, and the G20's outreach processes all illustrate the gap between formal inclusion and substantive participation. The AGDTA cannot simply assert that it will be different; it must be designed differently from the ground up. The mechanisms described below are designed with this specific concern in mind—not as concessions to political optics but as structural responses to a structural problem. Whether they are sufficient is a question that honest institutional evaluation, once the AGDTA is operational, will need to answer. The thesis does not claim otherwise. The AGDTA's commitment to Global South inclusion is therefore structural rather than aspirational. Minimum forty percent representation of developing economy nationals in the Council, ADTT bench, and senior management is a governance requirement, not a target. The rotating DG position between developed and developing economy nationals ensures that the institution's leadership reflects its global mandate. Regional sub-offices in Nairobi, São Paulo, and Jakarta provide the geographic presence necessary for meaningful engagement with the major developing economy regions—and signal that the AGDTA's centre of gravity is not exclusively in Abu Dhabi.

The Global South Fellowship provides fifty fully funded Academy positions annually for developing economy legal professionals. Judicial exchange secondments to the ADTT provide hands-on experience in digital trade adjudication. Technical assistance for AGDTA-compatible regulatory implementation enables developing countries to participate in the regulatory convergence initiative without the compliance capacity that large developed-economy regulators can take for granted.

Differentiated obligations—extended implementation timelines, reduced fees, and safeguard provisions against disruptive liberalisation—ensure that developing country participation is sustainable rather than nominal. The AGDTA's legitimacy depends on genuinely serving the interests of developing countries, not merely accommodating them.

5.4.3. **Implementation Roadmap**

Phase One (2025–2027) focuses on foundation: UAE Federal Decree establishing AGDTA as an international organisation with legal personality, immunity provisions, and headquarters in Abu Dhabi; ADGM legislative amendments incorporating ADTT jurisdiction; initial funding commitment from sovereign wealth sources at a scale commensurate with comparable international institutional launches (indicatively in the range of USD 300–500 million over ten years, subject to detailed feasibility assessment); Director-General appointment; Academy launch with university partnerships; Digital Trade Code drafting commencement; and bilateral negotiations with Singapore, UK, India, Kenya, and Brazil as early-adopter states.

Phase Two (2027–2029) focuses on operationalisation: ADTT commencing jurisdiction; GDAC launching all three tracks; DTRCI issuing first equivalence assessments; ADSS pilot with five participating jurisdictions; Digital Trade Code first edition published; first Global South Fellowship cohort enrolled.

Phase Three (2029–2032) focuses on expansion: ADTT jurisprudence developing depth; Abu Dhabi Convention on Digital Trade Judgments opened for signature; Regulatory Passport operational with a meaningful group of participating jurisdictions across multiple regions; ADSS interoperability with major regulatory frameworks; Digital Trade Code submitted to UNCITRAL as candidate model law; Global South Fellowship alumni present across a significant range of developing economies.

Phase Four (2032–2035) focuses on institutionalisation: AGDTA achieving financial self-sustainability; Abu Dhabi Convention entering into force with sufficient ratifications to establish meaningful multilateral reach; AGDTA referenced in WTO JSI outcome documents; major platforms voluntarily adopting AGDTA standards; Digital Trade Code adopted in a significant number of national jurisdictions. The specific metrics for each of these milestones are properly the subject of a detailed implementation plan developed in consultation with founding states and institutional partners, rather than targets fixed in advance of that process.

5.5.RESPONDING TO ANTICIPATED OBJECTIONS

5.5.1. 'Why Would States Cede Authority to Abu Dhabi?'

This objection misunderstands the AGDTA's design. States would not cede sovereignty—they would gain effective governance capacity that they currently lack. Digital trade is presently governed de facto by the terms of service of large US platforms and the regulatory preferences of the US and EU. Smaller and medium-sized states have minimal influence over the governance of digital commerce that profoundly affects their economies. AGDTA offers these states genuine voice in governance through the multi-stakeholder structure, and variable geometry participation allows them to pool only those competences they choose, retaining full control over others.

States currently accept international arbitration, WTO dispute settlement, and treaty-based constraints when they judge the benefits to exceed the costs. AGDTA presents the same cost-benefit calculus.

5.5.2. **'Existing Institutions Already Address These Issues'**

UNCITRAL develops model laws but lacks implementation infrastructure. The WTO addresses trade barriers but not private commercial law. The Hague Conference works on jurisdiction but not substantive law. Arbitral institutions provide dispute resolution but not regulatory coordination. No existing institution integrates all of these functions—and their integration is precisely the AGDTA's value proposition. The Digital Trade Code would be submitted to UNCITRAL for adoption; AGDTA findings would inform WTO negotiations; ADTT judgments would contribute to Hague Conference jurisprudence. The relationship is additive and complementary, not competitive.

5.5.3. **'The Proposal Is Too Ambitious'**

The variable geometry design of AGDTA means that it succeeds at any level of participation. Phase One delivers value—the GDAC provides dispute resolution before the ADTT reaches full operation; the Sandbox enables innovation testing before the regulatory passport achieves broad coverage—regardless of how many states ultimately participate in later phases. Private adoption of AGDTA standards by digital platforms can drive uptake independent of state ratification. The proposal is ambitious in its full form, but its architecture is designed to be modular: each pillar delivers independent value, and the integration benefits increase as participation grows.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The governance of international digital trade stands at a crossroads. The legal frameworks inherited from the twentieth century—designed for physical goods, territorial jurisdiction, and state-to-state relations—cannot adequately govern commerce conducted through global platforms, processed by algorithms, and mediated by data flows that respect no borders. This thesis has analysed these governance failures not merely to document inadequacy but to propose solutions grounded in original theoretical contributions and implementable institutional design.

My twenty-five years practising international commercial law from Abu Dhabi—advising multinationals on cross-border transactions, negotiating agreements that implicate multiple jurisdictions, and navigating the regulatory complexity of MENA operations—have given me an acute sense of the gap between digital commerce realities and legal framework capabilities. Transactions I structure routinely implicate five or more jurisdictions; the applicable law is often genuinely uncertain; enforcement is frequently problematic; and dispute resolution mechanisms designed for physical commerce strain visibly when applied to digital contexts. This professional experience has informed both the problem diagnosis and the solution architecture presented here.

6.1. ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP

This thesis introduces five original contributions to international commercial law and digital trade governance scholarship. Each represents a distinct advance beyond existing literature, and collectively they provide the theoretical foundation for the institutional proposals developed in Chapters Four and Five.

6.1.1. Algorithmic Legal Pluralism

The theory of Algorithmic Legal Pluralism, developed in Chapter Four, extends Teubner's concept of lex digitalis by recognising algorithmic systems not merely as private ordering but as autonomous normative orders with emergent properties. Its three key propositions—the algorithmic normativity thesis, the interlegality 2.0 framework, and the translation problem—provide conceptual apparatus for understanding and governing AI-driven commerce that existing legal pluralism theory does not supply.

The practical implication—that governance must address algorithmic ordering as a normative system requiring its own institutional competencies, doctrinal tools, and remedial mechanisms—is operationalised in the AGDTA through the Code-Native Arbitrator concept, the Technical Assessor System, and the Algorithmic Transparency principle of Digital Trade Constitutionalism.

6.1.2. Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling

The Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling framework, developed in Chapter Five, provides a model for transnational governance that transcends the sovereignty/harmonisation binary. Its distinction from EU supranationalism, treaty coordination, and regulatory networks is theoretically precise, and its mechanisms—variable geometry participation, functional equivalence recognition, and subsidiarity constraints—provide the architectural principles for the AGDTA's design.

The contribution extends governance theory by demonstrating that effective international coordination does not require either full sovereignty transfer or acceptance of binding treaty obligations—that a third model is available, grounded in voluntary pooling of specific competences through institutional arrangements whose benefits exceed their sovereignty costs.

6.1.3. The Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus

The Graduated Jurisdictional Nexus doctrine, proposed in Chapter Four, provides a systematic framework for jurisdictional competence in digital trade that replaces the inadequate binary analysis of existing doctrines with a graduated approach calibrated to the nature and intensity of digital engagement. Its three tiers—intensive digital presence, targeted engagement, and incidental access—provide workable criteria for jurisdictional determination that are directly applicable by courts and tribunals.

The doctrine addresses specific deficiencies in the Zippo sliding scale, the EU targeting doctrine, and the effects doctrine, while providing a model provision suitable for incorporation in national digital trade legislation and for submission to UNCITRAL as a candidate model law provision.

6.1.4. Digital Trade Constitutionalism

The Digital Trade Constitutionalism framework, developed in Chapter Five, extends trade constitutionalism scholarship from state-to-state relations to the private governance reality of digital commerce. Its seven constitutional principles—Digital Due Process, Data Dignity, Algorithmic Transparency, Platform Neutrality, Digital Access, Regulatory Legitimacy, and Jurisdictional Proportionality—provide normative foundation for institutional design and interpretive guidance for adjudication.

The contribution establishes a constitutional vocabulary for digital commerce governance that did not previously exist in the literature and that is operationalised in the AGDTA's Digital Trade Code and ADTT jurisprudence.

6.1.5. The Poly-Legal Adjudication Model

The Poly-Legal Adjudication model, introduced in Chapter Five as the ADTT's institutional design, represents an original contribution to international dispute resolution scholarship. The tri-traditional bench, institutionalising jurisprudential diversity within the adjudicative body itself, addresses limitations of both single-tradition tribunals applying foreign law through unfamiliar methodology and multiple-tradition panels without structured integration. The Technical Assessor System extends the model to technical pluralism, addressing the distinctive needs of technology-intensive disputes.

6.2. SYNTHESIS OF KEY FINDINGS

The thesis's findings are organised around three themes: the governance gap, the inadequacy of incremental reform, and the opportunity that Abu Dhabi's institutional capacity presents.

The governance gap is systematic rather than incidental. Chapter Three's examination of the institutional landscape demonstrates that existing instruments—WTO agreements, UNCITRAL model laws, OECD principles, regional trade agreements—were designed for physical commerce and apply to digital trade only imperfectly, incompletely, and inconsistently. Chapter Four's analysis of specific legal challenges—jurisdictional fragmentation, consumer protection deficits, data governance divergence, taxation disputes, and dispute resolution inadequacy—demonstrates the costs that this systematic mismatch imposes on commercial actors, consumers, and developing country participants in the digital economy.

The inadequacy of incremental reform is the thesis's most important structural finding. Existing reform efforts—adding digital trade chapters to preferential trade agreements, extending UNCITRAL instruments to new digital contexts, negotiating JSI outcomes at the WTO—represent adaptation of existing frameworks rather than structural responses to structural problems. They address the symptoms of the governance deficit while leaving its causes—the architectural mismatch between twentieth-century legal frameworks and twenty-first-century digital commerce—intact. The governance gap will not be resolved by incremental reform. It requires what this thesis proposes: a purpose-built institutional framework grounded in theoretical contributions that address the distinctive characteristics of digital commerce directly.

The Abu Dhabi opportunity is real and time-sensitive. ADGM has demonstrated the capacity for governance innovation that the AGDTA requires. Abu Dhabi has the resources, the strategic positioning, and the institutional track record to host the AGDTA credibly. The window for establishing effective international digital trade governance institutions—before geopolitical fragmentation hardens into permanent structural separation, before the techno-nationalist impulses documented by Luo and Van Assche (2023) foreclose the possibility of international coordination—may not remain open indefinitely.

6.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

6.3.1. For UAE and Abu Dhabi Authorities

Issue a Federal Decree establishing the AGDTA as an international organisation with legal personality, immunity provisions, and headquarters in Abu Dhabi. Amend ADGM's founding law to incorporate ADTT jurisdiction and the AGDTA institutional relationship. Commit initial funding from sovereign wealth sources at a level commensurate with the institution's mandate—the precise quantum is a matter for detailed feasibility study, but comparable international institutional frameworks suggest a ten-year horizon in the range of several hundred million dollars. Establish a high-level diplomatic initiative targeting Singapore, the UK, India, Kenya, and Brazil as early-adopter states—jurisdictions that share the interest in effective digital trade governance and are positioned to provide regional legitimacy for the AGDTA framework.

6.3.2. For International Organisations

UNCITRAL should establish a formal working relationship with the AGDTA Academy for Digital Trade Code development, with a structured pathway for eventual model law adoption. This relationship would position UNCITRAL as a partner in the AGDTA rather than a competitor, and it would provide the Digital Trade Code with the international legitimacy that UNCITRAL endorsement confers. The WTO should reference the AGDTA framework in JSI e-commerce negotiations as a potential plurilateral pathway—acknowledging that governance innovation can occur outside the WTO framework while remaining consistent with WTO principles. The Hague Conference should explore the relationship between the Abu Dhabi Convention on Digital Trade Judgments and the 2019 Hague Judgments Convention, identifying areas of complementarity and potential integration.

6.3.3. For the Private Sector

Major digital platforms should consider voluntary adoption of AGDTA standards in their terms of service, creating a private ordering pathway to AGDTA uptake that is independent of state participation. The terms of service of major platforms already constitute private governance frameworks of considerable normative force—their alignment with the Digital Trade Constitutionalism principles would represent a significant governance advance. Industry associations should engage with AGDTA governance through the Stakeholder Assembly. Legal professional associations should collaborate with the AGDTA Academy on Code-Native Arbitrator certification development, ensuring that the new professional category the GDAC requires is developed through credible institutional channels.

6.4. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This thesis opens multiple research avenues that exceed its scope. Empirical assessment of AGDTA implementation—through longitudinal study tracking pillar operationalisation, measuring case volumes, resolution times, enforcement rates, and user satisfaction—would provide the evidence base for iterative improvement of the framework. Extension of the Algorithmic Legal Pluralism theory to AI-generated content disputes, autonomous vehicle liability, and algorithmic discrimination claims would develop its applications beyond the commercial contracts context this thesis addresses.

The application of Regulatory Sovereignty Pooling to other governance domains—climate, health, cybersecurity—where similar sovereignty/coordination tensions exist would test the theory's generalisability and potentially develop a broader framework for transnational governance in the twenty-first century. Detailed doctrinal development of the Digital Trade Code provisions—the Algorithmic Mistake doctrine, AI Agency Attribution rules, and the Data-as-Consideration concept—through comparative case analysis and draft provisions would prepare the ground for submission to UNCITRAL. Assessment of the Global South inclusion mechanisms' actual effectiveness in ensuring developing economy participation and capacity development would be essential to the AGDTA's legitimacy evaluation.

6.5. FINAL REFLECTION

International commercial law has always evolved in response to commercial transformation. The lex mercatoria emerged from medieval trade fairs when existing legal frameworks could not accommodate the pace and complexity of international commerce. Modern arbitration developed alongside nineteenth-century industrialisation when domestic courts proved inadequate to international commercial disputes. The CISG and UNCITRAL model laws addressed twentieth-century globalisation when the proliferation of national laws created barriers to cross-border trade. Digital commerce represents a transformation of comparable magnitude—and the legal response has been fragmented, reactive, and inadequate.

This thesis has argued that incremental adaptation of existing frameworks is insufficient for reasons that are structural rather than circumstantial. It has proposed five original theoretical contributions and an integrated institutional framework designed to address the structural sources of the governance deficit directly. The Abu Dhabi Global Digital Trade Architecture is not the only possible institutional response to this challenge, but it is a coherent, implementable, and feasible one—grounded in demonstrated institutional capacity, sound theoretical foundations, and a genuine understanding of the practical realities of cross-border digital commerce as experienced by practitioners in the field.

The digital trade governance landscape awaits the kind of innovative thinking that institutional freedom enables. Abu Dhabi has demonstrated, through ADGM, that purpose-built legal architecture can address governance challenges that legacy systems cannot. The AGDTA scales that demonstrated capacity to address the global digital trade governance deficit. The question is no longer whether digital trade requires governance innovation—it manifestly does. The question is whether the political will and institutional ambition exist to build the framework that commerce, consumers, and the international economic system require.

The future of international commercial law will be written by those who act while others deliberate. This thesis is my contribution to ensuring that future serves global commerce equitably, efficiently, and justly.

REFERENCES

Aaronson, S. A., & Leblond, P. (2018). Another digital divide: The rise of data realms and its implications for the WTO. Journal of International Economic Law, 21(2), 245–272.

Abbott, K. W., Genschel, P., Snidal, D., & Zangl, B. (2021). Orchestration: Global governance through intermediaries. In The Spectrum of International Institutions (pp. 140–170). Routledge.

Ahmedov, I. (2020). The impact of digital economy on international trade. European Journal of Business and Management Research, 5(4).

Akpuokwe, C. U., Bakare, S. S., Eneh, N. E., & Adeniyi, A. O. (2024). Corporate law in the era of globalization: a review of ethical implications and global impacts.

Amro, I. A. S. (2019). Online arbitration in theory and in practice: a comparative study of cross-border commercial transactions in common law and civil law countries. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Arradhiya, M. R., & Febriani, H. (2025). Legal protection of e-commerce user privacy in Indonesia from the perspective of civil law and Islamic law. Proceeding International Conference Restructuring and Transforming Law, 4(1), 553–566.

Asensio, P. D. M. (2024). Conflict of Laws and the Internet. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Azmeh, S., Foster, C., & Echavarri, J. (2020). The international trade regime and the quest for free digital trade. International Studies Review, 22(3), 671–692.

Babikian, J. (2023). Navigating legal frontiers: exploring emerging issues in cyber law. Revista Espanola de Documentacion Cientifica, 17(2), 95–109.

Basedow, J., Drexl, J., Kur, A., & Metzger, A. (2022). Intellectual property in the conflict of laws. Mohr Siebeck.

Bartley, T. (2018). Transnational corporations and global governance. Annual Review of Sociology, 44(1), 145–165.

Baughen, S. (2023). Shipping law. Routledge.

Buckley, P. J., Enderwick, P., & Voss, H. (Eds.). (2022). International business. Oxford University Press.

Burri, M., & Polanco, R. (2020). Digital trade provisions in preferential trade agreements: introducing a new dataset. Journal of International Economic Law, 23(1), 187–220.

Chen, W. H., Lin, Y. C., Bag, A., & Chen, C. L. (2023). Influence factors of small and medium-sized enterprises and micro-enterprises in the cross-border e-commerce platforms. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 18(1), 416–440.

Chun, S. H. (2019). E-commerce liability and security breaches in mobile payment for e-business sustainability. Sustainability, 11(3), 715.

Devereux, M. P., & Vella, J. (2018). Implications of digitalization for international corporate tax reform. Intertax, 46(6/7).

Fox, W. F. (2018). International commercial agreements and electronic commerce. Kluwer Law International.

Gao, H. (2018). Digital or trade? The contrasting approaches of China and US to digital trade. Journal of International Economic Law, 21(2), 297–321.

Gitari, S. M. (2020). Reforming the institutional and legal frameworks of e-commerce in Kenya; consumer rights protection in the digital economy. Doctoral dissertation, Strathmore University.

González, J. L., & Ferencz, J. (2018). Digital trade and market openness. OECD Trade Policy Papers.

Guillaume, F., & Riva, S. (2023). Blockchain dispute resolution for decentralized autonomous organizations. In Blockchain and private international law (pp. 549–641). Brill Nijhoff.

Hamilton, L., & Webster, P. (2018). The international business environment. Oxford University Press.

Herdegen, M. (2024). Principles of international economic law. Oxford University Press.

Huang, J. (2018). Personal jurisdiction based on the location of a server: Chinese territorialism in the internet era. Wisconsin International Law Journal, 36, 87.

Huang, W., & Li, X. (2019). The E-commerce Law of the People's Republic of China: E-commerce platform operators liability for third-party patent infringement. Computer Law & Security Review, 35(6), 105347.

Hussain, Z., & Mari, A. K. (2023). Legal protection of customer privacy on e-commerce: a comparative study of Iranian and American law. International Journal of Marketing, Communication and New Media, 12.

Kacowicz, A. M. (2018). Regional governance and global governance: Links and explanations. Global Governance, 24, 61.

Kadıoğlu, C. Ç. (2019). Bricks and clicks: Online dispute resolution mechanisms and implementation of online arbitration in Turkey for cross-border business to consumer e-commerce disputes. Bilişim Hukuku Dergisi, 1(1), 113–146.

Khan, U. (2024). The World Trade Organization and international law: balancing trade, sovereignty, and global governance. Journal of Law, Society and Policy Review, 1(02), 01–17.

Khanderia, S. (2018). The Hague judgments project: assessing its plausible benefits for the development of Indian private international law. Commonwealth Law Bulletin, 44(3), 452–475.

Khidoyatov, M. (2025). Legal aspects of structuring cross-border transactions in the context of changing international regulation. The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology, 7(03), 14–21.

Kur, A., & Maunsbach, U. (2019). Choice of law and intellectual property rights. Oslo Law Review, 6(1), 43–61.

Kwilinski, A., Volynets, R., Berdnik, I., Holovko, M., & Berzin, P. (2019). E-commerce: concept and legal regulation in modern economic conditions. Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues, 22, 1.

Luo, Y., & Van Assche, A. (2023). The rise of techno-geopolitical uncertainty: implications of the United States CHIPS and Science Act. Journal of International Business Studies, 54, 1449–1460.

Meltzer, J. P. (2019). Governing digital trade. World Trade Review, 18(S1), S23–S48.

Mitchell, A. D., & Mishra, N. (2019). Regulating cross-border data flows in a data-driven world: how WTO law can contribute. Journal of International Economic Law, 22(3), 389–416.

Nahnybida, V., Bilousov, Y., Bliakharskyi, Y., Boiarskyi, I., & Ishchuk, A. (2022). Trade agreements, digital development and international commercial arbitration. Cuestiones Políticas, 40(74).

Orsini, A., Le Prestre, P., Haas, P. M., Brosig, M., Pattberg, P., Widerberg, O., & Chandler, D. (2020). Complex systems and international governance. International Studies Review, 22(4), 1008–1038.

Polański, P. P. (2018). Revisiting country of origin principle: Challenges related to regulating e-commerce in the European Union. Computer Law & Security Review, 34(3), 562–581.

Qi, X., Qin, W., & Lin, B. (2024). Case study on synergistic development strategy of cross-border e-commerce and logistics. PLOS One, 19(6), e0304393.

Sampani, C. (2021). Online dispute resolution in e-commerce: is consensus in regulation UNCITRAL's utopian idea or a realistic ambition? Information & Communications Technology Law, 30(3), 235–254.

Senftleben, M., & Angelopoulos, C. (2020). The odyssey of the prohibition on general monitoring obligations. Amsterdam/Cambridge.

Shaik, D., & Poojasree, M. V. (2021). Consumer protection in e-commerce: a legal and compliance framework in the digital market. In Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Law and Human Rights 2020 (pp. 18–23). Atlantis Press.

Shenkar, O., Luo, Y., & Chi, T. (2021). International business (4th ed.). Routledge.

Skaar, A. A. (2020). Permanent establishment: erosion of a tax treaty principle. Kluwer Law International.

Svantesson, D. J. B. (2018). Jurisdictional issues and the internet—a brief overview 2.0. Computer Law & Security Review, 34(4), 715–722.

Svantesson, D. J. B. (2021). Private international law and the internet (3rd ed.).

Trimble, M. (2020). Targeting factors and conflict of laws on the internet. Review of Litigation, 40, 1.

Tubishat, B. M. A. R. (2024). Electronic commerce and consumer protection in Jordan: the emerging trend. International Journal of Religion, 5(2), 328–345.

Tur, O., Kravchyk, M., Nastasiak, I., & Stetsyuk, N. (2023). Principles and aims of international private law. Social and Legal Studios, 4(6), 243–250.

Wardani, N. K., & Afriansyah, A. (2020). Indonesian legal challenges regarding electronic contracts in international trade. In 3rd International Conference on Law and Governance (pp. 23–30). Atlantis Press.

Wei, D. (2020). From fragmentation to harmonization of consumer law: the perspective of China. Journal of Consumer Policy, 43(1), 35–56.

Willemyns, I. (2020). Agreement forthcoming? A comparison of EU, US, and Chinese RTAs in times of plurilateral e-commerce negotiations. Journal of International Economic Law, 23(1), 221–244.

Willems, A., & Kamau, M. (2019). Of binding provisions and trust marks: roadmap to a global legal framework for the digital economy. Legal Issues of Economic Integration, 46(3).

You, C., & Bu, Q. (2020). Transformative digital economy, responsive regulatory innovation and contingent network effects: the anatomy of e-commerce law in China. European Business Law Review, 31(4).

Zhan, J. X. (2021). GVC transformation and a new investment landscape in the 2020s. Journal of International Business Policy, 4(2), 206–220.

Zhao, Y. (Ed.). (2018). International governance and the rule of law in China under the Belt and Road Initiative. Cambridge University Press.

Zheng, P., Qin, C., & Li, H. (2020). Navigating conflict of laws in international commercial arbitration in China. In Dispute Resolution in China, Europe and World (pp. 209–228). Springer.

Zürn, M. (2018). A theory of global governance: Authority, legitimacy, and contestation. Oxford University Press.