THE DIGITAL ECONOMIST

Date of Publication | December 22, 2025

Position Paper

Yuri Cataldo

The AI Trust Revolution: How Economic Incentives and Distributed Verification Solve Supply Chain Transparency

BLOCKCHAIN | ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE | SUPPLY CHAIN TRANSPARENCY

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Current efforts to supply chain transparency often fail because dishonesty remains more profitable than truth-telling. When verification depends on the integrity of the verified party, deception becomes an economic inevitability. Technology alone cannot solve this problem. We need to redesign incentive structures so that honesty is rewarded over exploitation.

We propose a three-party verification system built on blockchain-based economics, designed to make honesty more profitable than lying. Independent verifiers would be financially rewarded for identifying violations, while reputation stakes—tokens of verified credibility—would gain value over time, creating durable incentives for truthfulness. AI nodes enable continuous, large-scale monitoring by tracking specific indicators: electricity usage patterns that reveal actual working hours, bank transaction data that exposes wage theft, and satellite imagery that verifies organic farming claims.

This economic restructuring could reduce wage exploitation—from affecting 98 percent of garment workers to below 10 percent—while generating price premiums of around 9.7 percent for verified products and preventing significant reputational losses, such as Boohoo's £1.5 billion market-value decline. Consider Leicester's garment workers earning £3.50 per hour while producing clothes sold for £30: our system would make concealing such wage theft more expensive than paying fair wages.

Ultimately, this paper argues that the economic incentives—not technology alone—determine whether global supply chains operate with integrity.

1.

The Trust Crisis Revealed

In 2020, *The Sunday Times* exposed a story about clothing workers in Leicester factories manufacturing garments for Boohoo.[1] They earned £3.50 an hour, half the UK minimum wage. Within days, more than £1.5 billion in market value vanished from the retailer's share price.[2] This wage theft wasn't a compliance failure. It was rational economic behavior. When underpaying workers saves more money than the cost of getting caught, and buyers face no financial pressure to intervene, exploitation becomes the equilibrium outcome.

Digital audits can expose misconduct, but cannot change the profit calculus that makes it worthwhile. Boohoo sourced from hundreds of factories across multiple countries as part of its supply chain. The company claimed it was unaware of wage violations in Leicester, blamed subcontractors, and promised internal investigations and changes. Those investigations uncovered shell companies and fake invoices used in complex money-laundering and VAT–fraud schemes within its Leicester supplier network.[3] Although Boohoo later established transparency committees and adopted new technologies, these efforts failed because the underlying economic incentives remained unchanged.

This pattern repeats globally. In 2023, the US Department of Labor reported that garment contractors in Southern California earned as little as $1.58 per hour, despite the state's $15 per hour minimum wage.[4] In 2025, NPR profiled Maria, a seventy-three-year-old trimmer who earns 15 cents per piece, working until 3:00 a.m. to make roughly $375 weekly.[5] These exploited workers join millions across industries where honest reporting would cost them their jobs, a rational response to irrational economic structures.

Other industries show similar patterns. From 2008 to 2018, financial institutions paid approximately $26 billion in fines for anti-money-laundering and sanctions violations,[6] even as the global shadow economy grew to $12.5 trillion, or 11.8 percent of world GDP.[7] Healthcare networks struggle to prevent counterfeit drugs from circulating: the World Health Organization estimates one in ten medicines in developing countries is substandard or fake.[8]

Meanwhile, food supply chains lose track of contamination sources, leading to around fifteen thousand foodborne illnesses annually in the US.[9]

2.

Understanding Systemic Exploitation

The Boohoo scandal represents a pattern, not an exception. Nearly every major fashion brand has similar stories hidden within its complex supply chains: Nike's alleged wage theft in Indonesian supplier factories[10]; Zara's Brazilian workshops where inspectors documented conditions "analogous to slavery"[11]; and H&M's sourcing from Ethiopian factories paying some of the lowest garment wages in the world.[12] Each scandal follows the same script: claims of ignorance, promises to investigate, minor adjustments, and then continued exploitation. The issue extends beyond corporate ethics to structural economics. When verification depends on the integrity of those being verified, deception becomes not just possible but profitable. To understand why this persists, we must look at how global economic systems normalize exploitation

These wage disparities follow predictable patterns created by economic systems designed to incentivize low-cost labor. The same regions that provided cheap labor under colonialism now anchor global supply chains, where institutional barriers and weak labor protections preserve wage suppression. According to the International Labour Organization reports, fifty million people remain trapped in modern slavery, including twenty-eight million in forced labor[13]—a concentration of economic extraction that mirrors historical inequities.

A 2018 McKinsey study found that the top 20 fashion companies captured 97 percent of the industry's total economic profit,[14] illustrating how value concentrates at the top while risk and exploitation are externalized downward. This asymmetry makes underpayment not an accident but an efficient design feature of the system. Over 97 percent of US clothing comes from countries where minimum wages fall far below living standards. In Bangladesh, the world's second-largest garment exporter after China, the 2023 minimum wage increase to $113 per month fell far short of the $208 workers demanded for basic survival.[15] These disparities illustrate how value chains extract wealth upward while externalizing human costs. Most workers remain below subsistence levels despite producing goods that sell for hundreds of times their wages in Western markets.

This exploitation depends on engineered opacity. The fashion supply chain is "super fragmented and very dense," with a single shirt passing through hundreds of pairs of hands before it ever reaches a store shelf, each layer capturing profit while deflecting accountability.[16] Shell companies and subcontracting layers create legal and informational distance between those who benefit and those who suffer. In effect, wage theft in Bangladeshi factories directly subsidizes up to 90 percent retail margins in Manhattan boutiques.

The 2023 Fashion Transparency Index, which evaluated 250 major fashion companies, underscores the scale of opacity: 94 percent of brands did not disclose their energy sources, less than 1 percent published living wage data, and only 52 percent identified first-tier suppliers.[17] After billions invested in transparency tools, most companies still conceal the fundamentals of worker welfare—not through technical limits, but by design.

3.

Why Centralized Verification Cannot Work

Traditional verification assumes that central authorities can ensure accurate data entry. This assumption collapses when multiple entities with conflicting objectives operate across global supply chains. Current auditing fails because companies pay their auditors, creating an inherent conflict of interest. When Boohoo pays its auditor, the auditor's incentive is to preserve that revenue stream, not to uncover wage theft.

The fashion industry has invested billions in tracking technology. RFID tags monitor products. Blockchain platforms record transactions. The AURA Blockchain Consortium has registered over 40 million luxury products, while[18] De Beers Tracr platform currently hosts a digital inventory of more than 2.8 million rough diamonds, with a combined value of rough and polished stones of US$3.4 billion.[19] Walmart can now trace mangoes in 2.2 seconds rather than seven days.[20] Yet all these systems rely on human data entry. Without economic incentives for accuracy, garbage in still means garbage out.

Luxury brands embed NFC microchips in handbags. Fast-fashion retailers deploy RFID across their supply chains. Major retailers implement blockchain systems. But sensors and ledgers cannot verify fair treatment of workers unless honesty becomes more profitable than deception. Technology amplifies human incentives; it doesn't replace them.

4.

Consumer Action and Market Dynamics

Consumer pressure can create market opportunities for verification systems but remains structurally limited. The diamond industry demonstrates both potential and constraints. When “blood diamonds” entered public consciousness through media coverage and NGO campaigns in the late 1990s, governments, industry, and civil society created the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme in 2003 to regulate the trade in conflict diamonds. Today the scheme’s sixty participants represent eighty-six countries, accounting for more than 99 percent of the global rough diamond trade.[21] While critics highlight its enforcement weaknesses, it demonstrates how consumer pressure can build initial frameworks that evolve over time.

Research shows strong consumer willingness to pay for verified sustainability. A 2024 PwC survey found that 80 percent of consumers are willing to pay 9.7 percent more for sustainable clothing.[22] Similarly, Nielsen’s Global Corporate Sustainability Report noted that 66 percent would be willing to pay premiums for sustainable brands.[23] However, information asymmetries prevent consumers from distinguishing genuine transparency from marketing claims. Companies spend millions on sustainability advertising while making minimal structural changes.

These consumer pressures, though limited by information gaps, suggest a path forward: reconfiguring economic incentives so that transparency becomes more lucrative than deception. This is where blockchain economics provides crucial insights.

5.

The Economic Architecture for Truth

The blockchain revolution revealed something fundamental: trust doesn't require central authorities when economic incentives align participant interests. Bitcoin miners validate transactions not out of altruism, but because honesty pays better than fraud. Ethereum validators stake 32 ETH of their own funds and face automatic slashing penalties for dishonest behavior. Fewer than 0.04 percent of validators have ever been slashed, and most of those cases stem from operational errors rather than attempted attacks, underscoring how the protocol's incentives strongly favor honest validation.[24]

This principle can similarly transform supply chain verification through a three-party architecture where profits depend on mutual honesty. Unlike traditional auditing, in which the audited company controls payments, this model distributes power and incentives across three interdependent groups.

- **The Rules Writers:** NGOs and standards bodies that create machine-readable protocols defining terms like "fair wages" or "organic cotton." They earn fees only when their standards are adopted, aligning incentives with practical, enforceable rules rather than abstract ideals.
- **The Watchers:** Independent verification nodes—auditors, local NGOs, and AI systems—that stake their own capital and earn rewards for detecting violations. Unlike current auditors, who are paid by the companies they audit, these nodes profit from finding problems, creating powerful incentives for thorough investigation. They lose their staked capital if caught fabricating data, making collusion economically irrational.
- **The Participants:** Farmers, factories, and retailers who pay into a shared verification pool but gain more than they contribute through premium pricing, insurance discounts, and access to verified buyers. Their reputation scores, built through consistent compliance, become valuable assets they cannot afford to compromise.

6.

Technical Infrastructure: AI Verification at Scale

The three-party system requires continuous monitoring at a scale beyond the capacity of human auditors alone. Ten million suppliers, one hundred million workers, and billions of daily transactions, verification would cost more than the fashion industry's annual profits. Here, AI becomes essential—not as a replacement for human judgment but as an enabler of economic verification at scale.

MIT Media Lab's decentralized AI research, including its NANDA ("Networked AI Agents in a Decentralized Architecture") initiative, outlines how autonomous AI agents can be registered, authenticated, and endowed with cryptographically verifiable capabilities within a decentralized network.[25] In this kind of architecture, agents don't just make claims; they publish attestations that can be checked by other nodes using cryptographic proofs, reputation systems, and incentive mechanisms designed to reward honest contributions and penalize manipulation. Building on this blueprint, our proposed supply-chain verification layer for fashion has agents aggregating data from IoT sensors, satellite imagery, and transaction ledgers while staking reputation capital or economic value on the accuracy of their claims—forfeiting that stake when cross-checks reveal fabrication, competing for future verification tasks based on their verified track records, and earning more work only as their histories of accurate reporting compound.

Consider an AI node monitoring a factory in Dhaka. It analyzes electricity usage patterns during reported working hours; cross-references security camera logs to show worker arrivals and departures; compares wage payment records with bank transaction data; flags discrepancies for human investigation; and earns rewards based on the accuracy and importance of findings. The stake-based model ensures honesty; lying costs more than collusion could gain.

This hybrid human–AI approach combines automated scalability with human judgment for complex ethical issues. By aligning economic incentives and embedding appropriate technical infrastructure, the three-party system can achieve supply chain transparency at a truly global scale.

7.

Implementation Framework

Consider how the three-party system transforms a typical garment's journey from cotton field to retail store.

At the cotton-growing stage, current systems rely on annual organic inspections that farmers can easily circumvent. The new model deploys IoT sensors to monitor water usage, pesticide application, and soil health. Satellite imagery tracks crop rotation and growth patterns. Three independent verification nodes validate organic claims. Farmers maintaining verified organic status receive a 15 percent price premium, creating a direct economic incentive for compliance. An annual investment of $500 per hectare yields $2,000 in premium returns.

At the textile manufacturing stage, factories often claim monthly wages of $210 while paying only $113. Verification integrates smart meters to correlate energy consumption with working hours, while anonymous worker-reporting applications enable real-time wage validation without fear of retaliation. Bank API integrations confirm actual payments, and randomized local node checks establish ground truth. Factories maintaining verified fair wages receive priority orders from Western brands. A $50,000 annual verification investment can yield $500,000 in premium contracts, making ethical production economically rational.

At the brand integration stage, current systems allow brands to claim ignorance of supplier violations. The verified model creates a complete supply chain ledger on blockchain, giving consumers instant access via QR codes. Brands with verified supply chains can charge the 9.7 percent premium that consumers are willing to pay. Insurance firms reduce premiums by 20 percent to 30 percent for verified supply chains, recognizing lower risk exposure. A $2 million integration investment could generate $10 million in combined premium revenue and risk reduction.

8.

Financing the Trust Infrastructure

Building verification infrastructure demands substantial upfront investment —$2–5 million for major suppliers—but three funding mechanisms make this economically viable compared to the costs of the current system.

Consumer-driven premium models leverage documented willingness to pay more for verified products. As PwC's 2024 Voice of the Consumer survey found, "80 percent of consumers are willing to pay 9.7 percent more for sustainable clothing." This premium could fund verification while signaling a genuine commitment to transparency. For a $50 garment, a $4.85 premium can be distributed as follows: 40 percent to verified producers, 30 percent to verification infrastructure, 20 percent to brand implementation costs, and 10 percent to insurance and risk reduction pools.

Risk reduction investment recognizes that scandal costs far exceed verification expenses. Boohoo's £1.5 billion market loss was 750 times greater than the estimated cost of verifying its entire supply chain. Major brands could co-invest in shared verification systems, reframing from a compliance cost to a risk management asset.

Tokenized participation aligns with blockchain economics through token systems in which honest participants earn rewards and dishonest actors face penalties: factories that demonstrate transparency gain preferential contracts, insurance premiums, and priority buyer access. Reputation tokens earned through consistent honesty become valuable assets, creating powerful incentives for maintained compliance.

Transaction fees of 0.5 percent on verified trades can sustain substantial funding while adding minimal cost to individual transactions. For a $10 shirt, this adds only $0.05 at each step, totaling $0.20 to the final consumer, easily offset by premium consumers' willingness to pay.

9.

Regulatory Catalysis and Government Action

Government intervention can accelerate adoption through three existing mechanisms—none of which require new legislation.

- **Procurement Leverage:** As the largest purchaser of goods and services in the world, spending over $2 trillion annually, the US government wields considerable leverage at all levels of the economy.[26] By requiring verified suppliers, they could create immediate billion-dollar demand. Under existing Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) authority, blockchain wage verification could be mandated for uniform contracts by January 2026, granting verified suppliers a 15 percent bidding advantage.
- **Trade Integration:** Trade agreements can embed transparency requirements.[27] The upcoming USMCA joint review in 2026 provides an opportunity to tie preferential rates to verifiable supply-chain data[28] while the European Union's new supply-chain due diligence rules offer a working legislative precedent.[29] Mutual recognition agreements would ensure interoperability and prevent regulatory fragmentation.
- **Development Finance:** Institutions such as the World Bank and regional development banks could fund verification infrastructure as critical economic infrastructure—akin to ports, energy grids, or roads.[30] Adding verification components to supply chain development programs would align with their existing mandates.

Additionally, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) could classify wage theft as a material disclosure risk, compelling companies spending over $50 million on overseas manufacturing to verify or justify supply chain transparency. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) could fine unverified "ethically sourced" claims $50,000 per violation under existing truth-in-advertising authority.

10.

First-Mover Advantage in the Trust Economy

The nations that build global verification infrastructure become the trust broker of trade, commanding a potential $500 billion annual market in verification-based financial services.

Singapore, one of the world's most trade-dependent economies and a leading global hub for trade finance and digital trade, could mandate blockchain-based wage and provenance verification for letters of credit processed through its banks.[31] Switzerland, home to the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), the world's primary coordinator of international technical standards, could embed these verification schemas into global standards.[32] Together, such moves could seed "verification-hub" economies that generate tens of thousands of high-skilled jobs and control data streams capable of revealing global demand and risk patterns months before they appear in conventional statistics.

Verification data represents the new oil of the digital economy. Wage payment patterns predict government stability. Factory energy usage forecasts GDP. Supply chain flows forecast currency movements. The nation controlling verification data gains unprecedented economic intelligence. Estonia digitized its government for 1.3 million people with limited resources.[33] A comparable investment could verify 10 million suppliers worldwide.

11.

Why This Succeeds Where Others Failed

Previous transparency initiatives failed because they didn't alter fundamental economic incentives. Fair Trade and B Corp certifications rely on voluntary compliance without enforceable penalties. Regulatory frameworks like the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh ("Rana Plaza Accord") introduced major safety improvements through legally enforceable commitments and inspections, but they did not fully address broader labor-rights and purchasing-practice issues such as wages and freedom of association.[34] Technology solutions, from RFID to early blockchain traceability pilots, monitor products rather than working conditions. Consumer activism faces insurmountable information asymmetries.

The three-party verification system succeeds precisely because it makes honesty the only profitable strategy. Independent verifiers profit from uncovering violations rather than concealing them. Reputation stakes appreciate in value the longer compliance is maintained. Consumers can instantly verify claims rather than relying on static certification logos. Dishonesty, once invisible, now incurs immediate financial penalties through revoked verification status and reputational devaluation.

This system does not appeal to moral conscience—it rewires the logic of markets. It replaces the premise that "ethics is costly" with one where ethics generates yield. In this framework, truth becomes an appreciating asset and deceit a depreciating liability. The system works not because people become better, but because the economy itself makes better behavior the path of least resistance.

12.

Implementation Barriers and Strategic Responses

This system is not without its barriers and risks. Technical challenges include potential AI bias in supplier evaluations, requiring careful system design and regular auditing.[35] Digital divide issues may exclude participants without reliable internet access, necessitating alternative, low-tech verification methods for small producers. Sybil attacks, where bad actors create multiple fake identities, require robust identity verification and substantial financial stakes.

Industry resistance from those benefiting from opacity will manifest through lobbying against verification requirements, competitive pricing that undercuts verified products, and “transparency theater” that mimics verification without substance. However, first movers that adopt genuine verification will capture premium markets, ultimately compelling laggards to follow.

Regulatory complexity across jurisdictions—each with different privacy, labor, and surveillance laws—requires thoughtful system design. Mutual recognition agreements between regions can reduce complexity while maintaining consistent standards. The WTO’s Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement offers a framework for nondiscriminatory verification requirements that avoid protectionist implications.[36]

13.

The Path Forward

The three-party verification system represents more than technological innovation; it constitutes a fundamental restructuring of economic incentives in global trade. By making truth more profitable than deception, it addresses the root cause of supply chain exploitation rather than its symptoms.

In Leicester, workers still earn £3.50 per hour; in Los Angeles, $1.58; in Dhaka, $0.65. Not because we lack technology to track wages, but because lying still pays better than honesty. The three-party verification system reverses that logic. When independent verifiers profit from identifying violations, when reputation stakes appreciate over time, and when consumers can verify claims instantly, exploitation becomes economically irrational.

The technology already exists. Blockchain platforms process millions of transactions. AI systems monitor complex patterns. IoT sensors track conditions in real-time. Consumer willingness to pay premiums is well documented, and government procurement power could generate immediate demand. The only missing element is the economic restructuring that aligns incentives with transparency.

Implementation begins not with technology deployment but with recognizing a fundamental truth: in a world where honesty becomes profitable, exploitation becomes economically obsolete. This isn't idealism. It's economics. The question is not whether this transition will occur but whether current market leaders will drive it or be displaced by those who do.

For fashion brands and policymakers, the implications are clear. Supply chain transparency isn't a technical challenge demanding better sensors or databases. It's an economic one requiring restructured incentives. The three-party verification system delivers that restructuring, building markets where truth generates profits and deceit incurs loss. In such markets, transparency ceases to be an ethical choice but an economic imperative.

Endnotes

1. *The Sunday Times*. “Revealed: Fashion Chain Used Leicester Factory Paying £3.50 an Hour.” July 5, 2020. https://www.thetimes.com/uk/article/boohoos-sweatshop-suppliers-they-only-exploit-us-they-make-huge-profits-and-pay-us-peanuts-lwj7d8fg2.
2. Fashion United. “Boohoo Under Fire, Over 1.1 Billion Pounds Wiped Off Company Value.” July 7, 2020. https://fashionunited.uk/news/business/boohoo-under-fire-over-1-1-billion-pounds-wiped-off-company-value/2020070749741.
3. BBC Radio 4 File on 4, “Leicester Textile Firms ‘Involved in Money Laundering and VAT Fraud’,” October 13, 2020. https://www.retail-insight-network.com/news/leicester-money-laundering-clothing/.
4. US Department of Labor Blog. “The Exploitation of Garment Workers: Threading the Needle on Fast Fashion.” March 21, 2023. https://blog.dol.gov/2023/03/21/the-exploitation-of-garment-workers-threading-the-needle-on-fast-fashion.
5. NPR Planet Money. “Made in America: Garment Workers.” July 11, 2025. https://www.npr.org/2025/07/11/1255526971/garment-workers-clothing-made-in-usa.
6. Corporate Compliance Insights. “Global Financial Institutions Fined $26B for AML, Sanctions & KYC Noncompliance Since 2008.” September 26, 2018. https://www.corporatecomplianceinsights.com/global-financial-institutions-fined-26b-for-aml-sanctions-kyc-noncompliance-since-2008-financial-crisis/.
7. Ernst & Young (EY). *Global Shadow Economy Report 2025*. March 2025. Cited in Visual Capitalist, “Visualizing the World’s $12.5 Trillion Underground Economy,” May 28, 2025. https://www.visualcapitalist.com/worlds-12-5-trillion-underground-economy/.
8. World Health Organization. “Substandard and Falsified Medical Products.” Fact Sheet, December 3, 2024. https://www.who.int/news/item/28-11-2017-1-in-10-medical-products-in-developing-countries-is-substandard-or-falsified.

9. CDC Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. “Contributing Factors of Foodborne Illness Outbreaks, United States, 2014–2022.” March 13, 2025. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/74/ss/ss7401a1.htm.
10. Global Labor Justice–International Labor Rights Forum, Asia Floor Wage Alliance, and Portland Jobs with Justice. “Complaint to the Oregon Bureau of Labor and Industries: Wage and Employment Violations in the Global Supply Chain of Nike Inc.” May 30, 2025. https://globallaborjustice.org/news/complaint-to-the-oregon-bureau-of-labor-and-industries-wage-and-employment-violations-in-the-global-supply-chain-of-nike-inc/.
11. Repórter Brasil and SOMO. *From Moral Responsibility to Legal Liability? Modern Day Slavery Conditions in the Global Garment Supply Chain and the Need to Strengthen Regulatory Frameworks: The Case of Inditex–Zara in Brazil*. May 2015. https://reporterbrasil.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/From-moral-responsibility-to-legal-liability.pdf.
12. NYU Stern Center for Business and Human Rights. “Made in Ethiopia: Challenges in the Garment Industry’s New Frontier.” May 2019. https://bhr.stern.nyu.edu/publication/made-in-ethiopia-challenges-in-the-garment-industrys-new-frontier/.
13. International Labour Organization. “Global Estimates of Modern Slavery: Forced Labour and Forced Marriage.” September 12, 2022. https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/2025-09/ILO_GEMS-2022_Report_EN_Web.pdf.
14. McKinsey & Company. “The State of Fashion 2019: A Year of Awakening.” November 2018. https://www.mckinsey.com/~/media/McKinsey/Industries/Retail/Our%20Insights/The%20State%20of%20Fashion%202019%20A%20year%20of%20awakening/The-State-of-Fashion-2019-vF.ashx.
15. Bangladesh Ministry of Labor and Employment. “Minimum Wage Board Decision.” *Press Release*. November 7, 2023. https://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory/bangladesh-raises-monthly-minimum-wage-garment-workers-113-104687425.
16. BBC Future, “Why Fabric Fraud Is So Easy to Hide,” February 7, 2023. https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20230206-fabric-fraud-how-to-spot-fake-fabric-claims.
17. Fashion Revolution. “Fashion Transparency Index 2023.” July 12, 2023. https://www.fashionrevolution.org/fashion-transparency-index-2023/.

18. Business of Fashion. “Aura Blockchain Consortium Says It Has Logged More Than 40 Million Products.” May 2024. https://www.businessoffashion.com/news/technology/aura-blockchain-consortium-says-it-has-logged-more-than-40-million-products/?utm_source=chatgpt.com.
19. Accenture. “Tracr Pioneers Trust in Diamond Traceability.” Case Study, 2025. https://www.accenture.com/us-en/case-studies/natural-resources/tracr-diamond-traceability.
20. Linux Foundation Decentralized Trust. “How Walmart Brought Unprecedented Transparency to the Food Supply Chain with Hyperledger Fabric.” Case study, 2020. https://www.lfdecentralizedtrust.org/case-studies/walmart-case-study.
21. Kimberley Process. “Participants.” *Kimberley Process*. Accessed November 28, 2025. https://www.kimberleyprocess.com/participants.
22. PwC. “2024 Voice of the Consumer Survey: Consumers Willing to Pay 9.7% Sustainability Premium.” May 15, 2024. https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/news-room/press-releases/2024/pwc-2024-voice-of-consumer-survey.html.
23. Nielsen. “The Sustainability Imperative: New Insights on Consumer Expectations.” October 2015. https://www.nielsen.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2019/04/global-sustainability-report-oct-2015.pdf.
24. Consensys. “Understanding Slashing in Ethereum Staking: Its Importance & Consequences.” February 7, 2024. https://consensys.io/blog/understanding-slashing-in-ethereum-staking-its-importance-and-consequences.
25. Singh, Abhishek, et al. “A Perspective on Decentralizing AI.” MIT Media Lab, 2024. https://nanda.media.mit.edu/decentralized_AI_perspective.pdf.
26. Center for Labor and a Just Economy (CLJE:Lab). “Government Procurement and Spending Authority.” Building Worker Power in Cities & States Section 6. September 1, 2024. https://clje.law.harvard.edu/publication/building-worker-power-in-cities-states/government-procurement-and-spending-authority/.
27. Office of the United States Trade Representative. *Adapting Trade Policy for Supply Chain Resilience*. Washington, DC, October 2024. https://ustr.gov/sites/default/files/USTR_Adapting%20Trade%20Policy%20for%20Supply%20Chain%20Resilience_0.pdf.
28. Congressional Research Service. *US-Mexico-Canada (USMCA) Trade Agreement*. IF10997, updated December 6, 2024. https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF10997.

29. European Commission. “Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence.” Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers, 2024. https://commission.europa.eu/business-economy-euro/doing-business-eu/corporate-sustainability-due-diligence_en.
30. World Bank. *Digital Public Infrastructure and Development: A World Bank Group Approach. Digital Transformation White Paper, Volume 1*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2025. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/84c5073b-9d40-4b83-a211-98b2263e87dd/digital-public-infrastructure-and-development-a-world-bank-group-approach.
31. Asian Banking & Finance. “Automation Powers Singapore’s Trade Finance Future.” September 5, 2025. https://asianbankingandfinance.net/videos/automation-powers-singapores-trade-finance-future.
32. International Organization for Standardization (ISO). “About ISO.” Accessed November 28, 2025. https://www.iso.org/about.
33. Bitton, Mathis. “The Estonian Miracle: E-Estonia and the Future of Digital Infrastructure.” April 1, 2025. NYU School of Professional Studies. https://www.sps.nyu.edu/about/news-and-ideas/articles/etc/2024/the-estonian-miracle-e-estonia-and-the-future-of-digital-infrastructure.html.
34. Human Rights Watch. “Decade After Rana Plaza, Safety Flaws Persist in Garment Industry.” April 17, 2023. https://www.hrw.org/news/2023/04/17/decade-after-rana-plaza-safety-flaws-persist.
35. World Economic Forum. “Advancing Responsible AI Innovation: A Playbook.” September 2025. https://www.weforum.org/publications/advancing-responsible-ai-innovation-a-playbook/.
36. World Trade Organization. *Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade*. 1995. https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/17-tbt_e.htm.

Author

Yuri Cataldo

Yuri Cataldo is an award-winning entrepreneur, venture capitalist, author, and research scientist working at the intersection of artificial intelligence, technology, and business strategy. He is a Research Scientist at Autodesk Research, where he leads AI competitive intelligence, examining why many well-funded AI startups fail and identifying the structural, strategic, and market factors that differentiate those that successfully scale. A published author and frequent speaker, Yuri has evaluated more than 50 AI companies representing over $1 billion in aggregate funding, drawing insight from both successful investments and lessons learned from failed ventures. He holds an MBA from MIT and an MFA from Yale, and serves as a Senior Executive Fellow at The Digital Economist, where his research focuses on responsible innovation in artificial intelligence and blockchain, bridging research, investment, and execution to help emerging technologies move from promise to profit.

About

The Digital Economist, headquartered in Washington, D.C. with offices at One World Trade Center in New York City, is the world's foremost think tank on innovation advancing a human-centered global economy through technology, policy, and systems change. We are an ecosystem of 40,000+ executives and senior leaders dedicated to creating the future we want to see—where digital technologies serve humanity and life.

We work closely with governments and multi-stakeholder organizations to change the game: how we create and measure value. With a clear focus on high-impact projects, we serve as partners of key global players in co-building the future through scientific research, strategic advisory, and venture build out.

We engage a global network to drive transformation across climate, finance, governance, and global development. Our practice areas include applied AI, sustainability, blockchain and digital assets, policy, governance, and healthcare. Publishing 75+ in-depth research papers annually, we operate at the intersection of emerging technologies, policy, and economic systems—supported by an up-and-coming venture studio focused on applying scientific research to today's most pressing socio-economic challenges.

CONTACT: INFO@THEDIGITALECONOMIST.COM