

TBP TRADE AGREEMENT ON D GO®

A Real-Time Sovereign Trade, Distributed Production & Neutral Corridor Governance Framework

Concept Note

The Borderless Project — TBP World Vision Project

From Static Trade Agreements to Living Trade, Production and Economic-Exchange Frameworks

1. Executive Summary

The **TBP Trade Agreement On D Go®** is a proposed next-generation framework through which governments, regions and trade blocs could establish, operate, monitor and adapt international trade relationships within the **TBP Neutral Trade Corridor**.

Instead of relying exclusively on conventional agreements negotiated around numerous individual commodity quotas, participating sovereign authorities could establish an authorised **monetary trade envelope** — for example, an illustrative **US\$10 billion** — which becomes a shared and dynamically declining trade capacity accessible to verified SMEs, corporates and other eligible economic participants.

As qualifying transactions occur, their monetary value is deducted from the available agreement capacity in real time.

Authorities can monitor:

- total agreement value;
- utilisation;
- remaining capacity;
- SME and corporate participation;
- directional trade flows;
- sector concentration;
- tariff preferences;
- Rules of Origin;
- and agreement depletion.

The underlying TBP model already envisages monetary-value agreements operating as shared trade pools, with transactions deducting from the balance as trade occurs.

Participating governments retain the ability to pause, expand, reduce or renew the agreement and retain authority over domestic laws, eligibility requirements and trade limits.

The framework does **not** seek to replace sovereign trade policy, existing free trade agreements, customs administrations or domestic regulation.

Instead, TBP is proposed as a **neutral operating and coordination layer** through which agreed commercial rights, market access and economic participation can become more dynamic, transparent and accessible.

The architecture has also evolved to address a second challenge: modern production is increasingly distributed.

A manufacturer may be headquartered in one country, use components from several others, undertake processing at another location, complete final production close to its target market and subsequently sell the resulting product across several countries.

Trade Agreement On D Go® therefore incorporates a proposed:

TBP Neutral Corridor Origin Architecture™

designed to distinguish clearly between:

corporate nationality;

input origin;

production location;

sovereign jurisdiction;

customs status;

and

trade-agreement eligibility.

The architecture contains four proposed pathways:

1. **Origin Continuity™**
2. **Corridor Cumulation™**
3. **TBP Corridor Production Cumulation™**
4. **Agreement-Qualifying Corridor Goods™**

These mechanisms are intended to enable distributed production without falsely assigning national origin and while keeping participating sovereign governments in control of what qualifies for preferential treatment.

Once this architecture is established, a wider economic opportunity emerges.

The same infrastructure could allow manufacturers to become more **adaptive in where they trade, process and manufacture**, while creating a new pathway through which lower-income, least-developed and industrialising economies — particularly across the Global South — could participate progressively in international production networks.

This broader implication is introduced gradually within this concept note.

The core proposition remains:

A trade agreement that operates dynamically in response to real economic activity.

2. The Challenge Facing International Trade

Traditional trade agreements remain essential instruments of economic diplomacy.

However, the existing TBP concept identifies several limitations in their operating model:

- negotiations may take years;
- assumptions can become outdated;
- benefits may become concentrated among larger corporates;
- SMEs can struggle to access agreement benefits;
- governments may lack real-time visibility over utilisation;
- and implementation can become fragmented across multiple administrative systems.

Global commerce is also becoming increasingly dynamic.

Businesses must respond to:

- changing demand;
- geopolitical disruptions;
- supply-chain interruptions;
- tariffs;
- energy availability;
- logistics constraints;
- market shocks;
- technological change;
- and changing production economics.

Yet the infrastructure governing trade frequently remains comparatively static.

The question is therefore not whether conventional treaties remain necessary.

They do.

The question is whether a complementary operating architecture can allow agreed trade relationships to respond more effectively to real economic activity.

3. The TBP Proposition

Trade Agreement On D Go® proposes that a trade agreement can operate simultaneously as:

a sovereign commercial authorisation;

a live monetary trade pool;

a market-access framework;

an SME participation mechanism;

a production and supply-chain framework;

a Rules-of-Origin architecture;

a services and tourism framework;

and

a real-time government oversight system.

The objective is to transform trade agreements from primarily static legal instruments into:

Living Economic Frameworks

capable of responding dynamically to actual commercial utilisation.

4. What Trade Agreement On D Go® Is — and Is Not

Trade Agreement On D Go® is not intended to create a supranational trade authority.

It does not remove:

- sovereign borders;

- national customs law;
- domestic regulation;
- sanctions;
- export controls;
- health and safety requirements;
- national-security powers;
- or existing treaty obligations.

Participation is intended to remain voluntary, corridor-based and non-exclusive, with sovereign authorities retaining control over domestic law and agreement limits.

TBP instead provides the proposed:

Neutral Operating Layer

through which authorised trade and economic activity can be coordinated.

The governing principle is:

Neutral infrastructure. Sovereign control.

5. Sovereign Monetary Agreement Architecture

At the centre of the framework is the:

Sovereign Monetary Trade Cap

Instead of beginning with hundreds of commodity-specific quotas, participating authorities may establish a total authorised economic value.

Illustrative Agreement

Parameter	Illustrative Position
Participants	United Kingdom ↔ Indonesia
Agreement Type	Bilateral
Monetary Cap	US\$10 billion
Participant Access	SMEs + Corporates
Sector Coverage	Multi-sector
Status	Active
Origin Architecture	TBP-enabled, subject to sovereign agreement

Parameter	Illustrative Position
Monitoring	Real time

The **US\$10 billion figure is illustrative** and is not intended to represent an existing or proposed commitment by either government.

A qualifying transaction then utilises part of the agreement.

Example

Total Agreement: US\$10.000bn

Transaction: US\$25m

Remaining Capacity: US\$9.975bn

The trade agreement therefore becomes a measurable pool of authorised economic activity.

6. Why a Monetary Agreement?

A monetary-value framework can provide greater flexibility than negotiating every possible transaction at product level.

The TBP Executive Summary proposes monetary caps specifically as an alternative to commodity-by-commodity allocation.

This does not mean products become unregulated.

Instead, the architecture separates:

Aggregate economic authorisation

from

transaction-level policy and compliance.

Governments can therefore determine the total economic exposure while retaining detailed controls over what activity is permitted inside it.

7. Policy Guardrails

The monetary pool remains subject to sovereign conditions.

These may include:

- prohibited-goods lists;
- product restrictions;
- sector restrictions;
- Rules of Origin;
- sanctions;
- export controls;
- licensing;
- tariffs;
- customs requirements;
- environmental requirements;
- safety standards;
- national-security controls;
- trader eligibility;
- and directional limits.

The underlying TBP framework already envisages transactions being checked against corridor rules, prohibited goods, eligibility requirements and host-country laws before execution.

The hierarchy therefore becomes:

Sovereign Monetary Trade Cap

↓

Shared Agreement Pool

↓

Policy & Eligibility Guardrails

↓

Verified Traders and Manufacturers

↓

Transaction



Compliance & Origin Check



Execution



Real-Time Deduction



Settlement / Production / Logistics



Government Oversight

8. Participating Economic Actors

Trade Agreement On D Go® is designed to support broad participation.

Governments & Trade Blocs

Define and supervise the agreement.

SMEs

Access opportunities without needing to be individually named in treaty negotiations.

Corporates & Exporters

Undertake larger transactions under transparent agreement rules.

Manufacturers

Participate in conventional or distributed production chains.

Service Providers

Provide qualifying professional and commercial services.

Regulators & Customs Authorities

Maintain oversight and determine legal compliance.

Tourism & Cultural Economy Participants

Participate in qualifying commercial and non-commercial exchange activities.

SMEs are particularly important.

The original architecture expressly envisages a shared trade pool accessible by thousands of verified traders, with SMEs included by default.

9. Agreement Sector Architecture

The framework currently recognises:

Sector	Indicative Scope
Energy	Fuels, energy products and approved energy activity
Food & Agriculture	Agricultural products and food trade
Manufacturing	Industrial and manufactured products
Merchandise	Wider merchandise trade
Services	Cross-border commercial services
Technology & Data	Technology and approved digital activity
Construction	Construction goods and services
Logistics	Freight, transport and distribution
Minerals & Critical Minerals	Minerals and critical-material supply chains
Pharmaceuticals	Pharmaceutical products and manufacturing
Tourism & Cultural Exchange	Tourism, hospitality, cultural and creative activity

Gold, lithium and comparable commodities would sit within:

Minerals & Critical Minerals

rather than being treated as separate top-level sectors.

10. Real-Time Trade Execution

An eligible transaction could proceed through a sequence such as:

Trader verification

↓

Agreement identification

↓

Available monetary capacity

↓

Sector eligibility

↓

Rules-of-Origin assessment

↓

Tariff / preference assessment

↓

Regulatory compliance

↓

Transaction approval

↓

Agreement-cap deduction

↓

Settlement and logistics

↓

Government dashboard update

The original TBP App architecture already anticipated government dashboards, AI-assisted trade matching and automated agreement monitoring.

11. Directional Trade and Imbalance

A shared agreement pool does not mean governments lose visibility over bilateral trade direction.

The system can separately measure:

Country A → Country B

and

Country B → Country A

For example:

Illustrative US\$10bn Agreement

Nigeria → India: US\$3.2bn

India → Nigeria: US\$2.6bn

Remaining agreement capacity: US\$4.2bn

Governments can therefore monitor:

- exports;
- imports;
- net position;
- participant share;
- trade imbalance;
- and directional concentration.

Where required, governments could also introduce specific directional sub-limits.

12. Sovereign Intervention

An authority may decide during the operation of an agreement to:

- increase the monetary cap;
- reduce the cap;
- pause access;
- reopen access;

- impose a directional ceiling;
- adjust policy conditions;
- or renew the agreement.

This converts the agreement into a more responsive economic framework.

An illustrative US\$10bn agreement could use scalable adjustment assumptions such as:

Adjustment	Illustrative Value
2.5%	US\$250m
5%	US\$500m
10%	US\$1bn
25%	US\$2.5bn
Custom	Sovereign-defined

These are simulation assumptions, not proposed legal limits.

13. Tourism & Cultural Exchange

Trade Agreement On D Go® should recognise that economic relationships between countries extend beyond physical merchandise.

Tourism, hospitality, conferences, entertainment, cultural industries, exhibitions, film, music and creative activity can generate significant international economic value.

The framework therefore includes:

Tourism & Cultural Exchange

as a recognised agreement sector.

It should distinguish between two layers.

Commercial Activity

Examples include:

- hotel expenditure;
- travel services;
- tour operators;
- conferences;
- commercial exhibitions;

- entertainment;
- creative-industry services;
- festivals;
- and related visitor expenditure.

Where agreed, these activities can utilise the monetary agreement.

Non-Commercial Cultural Exchange

Governments may separately monitor:

- delegations;
- artists;
- cultural programmes;
- institutions;
- exchange activities;
- festivals;
- educational visits;
- and participating organisations.

These need not necessarily consume monetary agreement capacity.

The result is an agreement that can measure both:

economic exchange

and

people-to-people exchange.

14. Pharmaceuticals

Pharmaceuticals should be treated as a dedicated sector because they combine:

- manufacturing;
- intellectual property;
- specialist logistics;
- product registration;
- cold-chain requirements;
- Rules of Origin;
- quality standards;
- and sovereign health regulation.

Rules of Origin determine potential trade preference.

They do **not** determine whether a medicine is authorised for use.

Products remain subject to applicable:

- GMP requirements;
 - medicines regulation;
 - licensing;
 - product registration;
 - quality and safety rules;
 - customs procedures;
 - and relevant health regulation.
-

15. The Distributed Production Challenge

Modern manufacturing increasingly operates across several jurisdictions.

A manufacturer may:

design a product in one country;

source materials in another;

manufacture components elsewhere;

undertake final assembly near the target market;

use a bonded logistics facility;

and subsequently export to several destinations.

This creates an important question for Trade Agreement On D Go®:

How can manufacturers operate across a neutral corridor without undermining Rules of Origin?

The answer should not be to eliminate origin.

It should be to make origin more transparent.

16. Corporate Nationality Is Not Product Origin

A fundamental principle of the framework is:

The nationality of the manufacturer does not automatically determine the origin of the product.

A British manufacturer operating a factory in Indonesia does not necessarily manufacture a British-origin product.

Origin depends upon applicable Rules of Origin, including where production occurred and whether the relevant transformation requirements have been satisfied.

The UK–India agreement demonstrates the conventional principle that products seeking preferential treatment must satisfy applicable origin criteria and that qualifying rules are designed to ensure that only genuinely originating goods receive preferential treatment.

The TBP architecture must preserve this distinction.

17. TBP Neutrality Does Not Mean Extraterritoriality

Another foundational principle is:

Neutrality ≠ Extraterritoriality

A TBP facility physically located in Indonesia does not cease to be inside Indonesian sovereign territory merely because it operates under a neutral TBP framework.

Likewise, a TBP facility in another sovereign state remains subject to the applicable territorial jurisdiction unless the relevant government provides a particular customs status under law.

TBP neutrality therefore means:

Neutral Commercial Access

Neutral Operating Protocol

Sovereign-Recognised Customs or Agreement Status

It does not mean the creation of artificial sovereign territory.

18. Three-Layer Jurisdiction Architecture

Every TBP production facility should therefore be understood through three distinct layers.

Layer 1 — Sovereign Territory

Where is the facility physically located?

Example:

Indonesia

Layer 2 — Customs / TBP Status

How has the relevant government designated the facility?

Example:

Agreement-Recognised TBP Neutral Production Zone

Layer 3 — Origin & Agreement Status

What origin and preferential treatment does the product acquire?

Example:

Indonesian origin

or

cumulated origin

or

Agreement-Qualifying Corridor status

The three layers must remain independent.

19. Final Production Must Be Separated from Final Handling

The system should distinguish:

Final Substantial Production

from

Post-Production Handling

because they can have very different origin consequences.

Warehousing, storage, labelling or repacking is not equivalent to substantive manufacturing.

The Laboratory therefore needs to capture:

Field	Purpose
Manufacturer Home / Sponsoring Economy	Corporate relationship
Input Origin(s)	Source of qualifying inputs
Primary Production	Earlier-stage manufacturing
Final Substantial Production	Meaningful final transformation
Production Facility	TBP or conventional facility
Production Operation	Nature of processing
Post-Production Handling	Storage, packaging, labelling etc.
Customs / TBP Status	Facility treatment
Market of Release	Where product enters commerce
Onward Export Market	Subsequent destination
Origin Pathway	Applicable origin mechanism
Eligible Input Share	Qualifying contribution
Product-Specific Threshold	Origin test

20. TBP Neutral Corridor Origin Architecture™

The proposed origin system contains four pathways.

These mechanisms do not automatically create legal rights.

Where they extend beyond existing trade arrangements, they would require recognition by participating governments.

20.1 Origin Continuity™

Purpose

Preserve an established origin where an already-originating product moves through an approved TBP Neutral Corridor facility for transit, storage or limited non-transformative handling.

Examples may include:

- storage;

- unloading;
- reloading;
- preservation;
- splitting consignments;
- approved labelling;
- and other limited handling.

Illustrative Journey

UK-origin product

↓

TBP Corridor Facility

↓

Storage / approved handling

↓

Destination market

TBP handling should not artificially create a new origin.

The purpose is to preserve legitimate origin continuity.

21. Corridor Cumulation™

Purpose

Allow qualifying originating materials and processing contributed by participating economies to count together toward the applicable origin calculation where the underlying agreement permits it.

Example

UK qualifying component — 35%

Indonesian qualifying input — 30%

Qualifying production — 35%

↓

Finished Product

The product is then assessed according to the applicable product-specific rule.

TBP does not itself determine legal origin.

Its role is to provide the infrastructure for:

- tracing;
 - calculation;
 - documentation;
 - verification;
 - and agreement administration.
-

22. TBP Corridor Production Cumulation™

This pathway addresses production undertaken at an approved TBP facility located:

inside one of the participating sovereign territories.

Proposed Principle

Qualifying production undertaken at an Agreement-Recognised TBP Neutral Corridor facility located within either participating Party may contribute to originating status in accordance with the applicable product-specific Rules of Origin.

Example

A UK pharmaceutical manufacturer operates at:

TBP Neutral Production Facility — Indonesia

The manufacturer may remain British.

The facility remains physically within Indonesia.

The facility remains subject to Indonesian sovereign jurisdiction.

But the facility can also carry an agreed:

TBP Neutral Corridor production status.

Where substantive manufacturing occurs there, its contribution can be considered under the relevant Rules of Origin and negotiated cumulation provisions.

23. Agreement-Qualifying Corridor Goods™

The fourth pathway addresses a different situation.

What happens when substantive production occurs at an approved TBP facility **outside the territories of the participating parties**, including potentially an offshore neutral production node?

TBP should not artificially assign the finished product a national origin it has not acquired.

Instead, participating sovereign governments could create an explicit agreement category:

Agreement-Qualifying Corridor Good™

through a treaty annex or protocol.

Example

UK qualifying inputs

Indonesian qualifying inputs

↓

Substantive production at authorised offshore TBP facility

↓

Finished product

The ordinary national origin of the finished product would still be determined under applicable law.

Separately, the participating governments could decide whether production undertaken at that authorised facility receives specified treatment under their bilateral agreement.

This creates an important distinction between:

National Origin

and

Agreement Eligibility.

24. The Two TBP Production Cases

The proposed architecture consequently creates two fundamentally different TBP production situations.

Case A — TBP Facility Inside a Participating Country

Example:

TBP Indonesia

within a UK–Indonesia arrangement.

The primary questions are:

Jurisdiction + Origin + Cumulation

What production occurred?

Which inputs qualify?

What is the product-specific rule?

What customs status applies?

Can contributions from both economies be cumulated?

Case B — TBP Facility Outside the Participating Countries

Example:

Offshore TBP Neutral Production Platform

The principal questions become:

Agreement Eligibility + Treaty Annex

The product does not automatically become UK or Indonesian.

The sovereign parties would need explicitly to determine how recognised corridor production should be treated.

25. When Final Production Happens in the Importing Country

This distinction is particularly important.

Consider:

Manufacturer: UK company

Importing / destination economy: Indonesia

Final substantive production: Indonesia

Facility: TBP Neutral Corridor — Indonesia

Final market: Indonesia

If the meaningful final manufacturing happens in Indonesia, it may be misleading to characterise the completed product simply as a British finished product being imported into Indonesia.

The chain may instead be:

UK components / technology

↓

Import of inputs into Indonesia

↓

Substantive Indonesian production

↓

Finished product released into the Indonesian market

The Laboratory should therefore report independently:

Corporate economy: United Kingdom

Production jurisdiction: Indonesia

TBP status: Agreement-recognised facility

Indicative origin: determined according to applicable origin rules

Domestic-market treatment: potentially domestic finished production rather than importation of a finished British good

Treatment of UK inputs: separately assessed

This creates a much more accurate representation of distributed manufacturing.

26. Onward Export and Reverse Trade

Distributed manufacturing may create additional trade flows.

Suppose a UK manufacturer produces US\$500 million of pharmaceuticals within Indonesia.

The output might eventually be:

US\$300m → Indonesian domestic market

US\$100m → ASEAN markets

US\$100m → United Kingdom

The US\$100m entering Britain would then be assessed as a separate trade movement.

If the goods qualify as Indonesian-origin products, the relevant question becomes:

Do these Indonesian-origin goods qualify for preferential entry into the United Kingdom?

The fact that the corporate owner is British does not answer that question.

This can create a new commercial relationship:

British investment → Indonesian production → local employment → regional exports → exports to Britain

Trade therefore evolves into shared production.

27. Adaptive Trade & Manufacturing On D Go™

At this stage, a wider implication of the architecture begins to emerge.

The original Trade Agreement On D Go® proposition concerns the ability to make trade agreements more dynamic.

The same philosophy can gradually extend to **where commercial and productive activity takes place.**

A company may not always need to operate from one fixed production geography.

Subject to sovereign law, commercial viability and applicable Rules of Origin, it could progressively access different authorised TBP facilities according to:

- demand;
- supply conditions;
- energy availability;
- logistics;
- market proximity;
- production requirements;
- and risk.

This can be described as:

Adaptive Trade & Manufacturing On D Go™

The concept does not mean manufacturers become jurisdictionless.

They remain legally accountable.

What becomes more adaptive is the location from which eligible economic activity can be undertaken.

28. From Trade Access to Production Access

This creates an important development implication.

Traditionally, access to a trade agreement means primarily:

access to a market.

TBP introduces the possibility that it could also progressively mean:

access to production opportunity.

A participating economy should not necessarily have to possess every element of a complete industrial ecosystem before its businesses, resources and workforce can participate meaningfully in an international production chain.

A developing or industrialising economy may initially contribute:

- raw materials;
- agricultural products;

- minerals;
- labour;
- logistics;
- packaging;
- processing;
- maintenance;
- services;
- or SMEs.

As capability increases, participation may move further into:

- components;
- assembly;
- processing;
- final production;
- and regional exports.

The Neutral Corridor can therefore potentially serve as a **bridge between trade participation and productive participation**.

This is an opportunity rather than an automatic development outcome.

Successful industrialisation would still require appropriate sovereign policy, infrastructure, skills, investment and domestic economic linkages.

29. Opportunity for the Global South

This proposition may be particularly relevant to lower-income, least-developed and industrialising economies across the Global South.

Many possess:

- significant populations;
- growing consumer markets;
- natural resources;
- agricultural capacity;
- strategic geography;
- and labour forces;

but may not yet possess the capital or infrastructure needed to develop every stage of an advanced production ecosystem independently.

The TBP Neutral Corridor could potentially provide access to shared:

- production facilities;
- processing capacity;
- logistics;
- energy;
- storage;
- technology;
- and market connectivity.

Subject to the applicable agreement and Rules of Origin, this could allow participating economies to enter international production chains at an earlier stage.

The development pathway could gradually move from:

Commodity Export

→

Processing

→

Component Participation

→

Shared Production

→

Domestic Manufacturing

→

Regional Export

The purpose is not for TBP infrastructure to replace domestic industrialisation.

The stronger objective would be:

to use shared corridor capacity as a bridge toward deeper domestic productive capability.

30. Manufacturing Closer to the Importing Market

The same architecture offers a complementary proposition to manufacturers from more developed industrial economies.

A manufacturer seeking access to a large emerging market frequently faces a choice between:

exporting finished goods over long distances;

or

making a large permanent investment in a new factory.

An authorised TBP production network could create an intermediate option.

The manufacturer could locate selected production:

closer to the importing market

while potentially using:

- local suppliers;
- local labour;
- local services;
- domestic materials;
- local logistics;
- and regional distribution networks.

Illustrative Model

UK technology / design

Indonesian materials / suppliers

↓

TBP Indonesia production facility

↓

Final production

↓

Indonesia

ASEAN

possible UK re-export

For the manufacturer, this can increase flexibility and proximity to demand.

For the host economy, it can create greater opportunity for:

- industrial participation;
- local value addition;
- employment;
- supply-chain development;
- skills;
- and regional exports.

The interests of the manufacturer and the industrialising economy can therefore become more closely aligned.

31. Avoiding an Enclave Model

Production inside a TBP facility should not automatically be assumed to benefit the surrounding economy.

A facility that imports every input, develops no domestic suppliers and creates little local capability could function as an industrial enclave.

Governments should therefore retain the ability to negotiate development conditions where appropriate.

These might include:

- supplier-development programmes;
- skills programmes;
- apprenticeships;
- SME participation;
- local processing;
- research collaboration;
- technology partnerships;
- or other measurable domestic-development objectives.

Such requirements should remain:

sovereign-negotiated

rather than universally imposed by TBP.

32. Origin Becomes the Enabler

The four TBP origin pathways become especially important once distributed manufacturing is introduced.

Origin Continuity™

allows an already-originating product to move through approved corridor logistics without unnecessarily disrupting origin.

Corridor Cumulation™

allows qualifying contributions from participating economies to be combined where the agreement permits.

TBP Corridor Production Cumulation™

allows qualifying production at an approved TBP facility inside a participating sovereign territory to contribute to origin.

Agreement-Qualifying Corridor Goods™

creates a possible treaty pathway for recognised production outside the participating sovereign territories.

Together they make distributed manufacturing potentially compatible with sovereign trade rules.

33. Proposed Digital Origin & Production Passport™

A future implementation could establish a:

TBP Digital Origin & Production Passport™

for qualifying products or production batches.

It could record:

- manufacturer;
- corporate jurisdiction;
- production facilities;
- input sources;
- HS classification;
- production operations;
- dates;
- customs status;
- applicable agreement;
- origin pathway;
- qualifying value contribution;
- non-originating inputs;
- product-specific rule;
- supporting documentation;
- market of release;
- onward exports;
- and verification events.

The objective would be:

to make distributed production auditable rather than invisible.

The original TBP architecture already envisages AI, digital transaction matching, smart-contract-style mechanisms, APIs, KYC/AML controls and integrated corridor data.

34. Anti-Circumvention

Flexibility must not become a means through which third-country goods improperly receive preferential access.

The UK–India agreement provides a useful conventional benchmark: Rules of Origin are intended both to facilitate legitimate use of third-country materials where permitted and to ensure that only genuinely qualifying goods receive preferences.

The TBP framework should consequently incorporate:

- substantial-transformation requirements;
- product-specific rules;

- qualifying-value thresholds;
- digital traceability;
- approved-facility registration;
- documentation;
- customs audit trails;
- prohibited-goods controls;
- sanctions screening;
- verification;
- and sovereign suspension rights.

Agreement-Qualifying Corridor Goods™ should therefore be **more traceable, not less traceable**, than conventional goods.

35. Sovereign Authority

TBP does not determine customs law.

Participating governments determine:

- whether TBP facilities are recognised;
- what production qualifies;
- which origin rules apply;
- what cumulation is permitted;
- which tariff preferences apply;
- what documentation is required;
- which sectors are excluded;
- and when preferential treatment can be suspended.

TBP provides the proposed operating infrastructure.

Sovereigns provide the legal authority.

36. Government Trade Agreement Laboratory™

The **TBP Government Trade Agreement Laboratory™** provides the simulation environment through which a government, trade agency, regional bloc or authorised economic institution can explore how a proposed agreement might operate before implementation.

Potential scenarios include:

UK ↔ Nigeria

UK ↔ Indonesia

India ↔ Nigeria

EU ↔ Africa

ASEAN ↔ GCC

African regional agreements

and

10-country or larger multilateral arrangements.

The Laboratory is intended to move the discussion from:

“Here is the concept.”

toward:

“Let us simulate what happens.”

37. What the Laboratory Can Measure

Agreement Economics

- agreement cap;
- utilised amount;
- remaining capacity;
- utilisation rate;
- depletion rate.

Directional Trade

- exports;
- imports;
- net trade position;
- directional limits;
- imbalance indicators.

Participation

- SMEs;
- corporates;
- transactions;

- SME monetary share.

Sectors

- sector value;
- top-sector share;
- concentration indicators.

Tariff Preference

- reference tariff;
- agreement tariff;
- indicative tariff saving.

Rules of Origin

- manufacturer economy;
- input origin;
- production jurisdiction;
- substantial transformation;
- TBP facility status;
- qualifying contribution;
- origin pathway.

Distributed Production

- primary production;
- final substantial production;
- post-production handling;
- market release;
- onward export.

Tourism & Culture

- commercial tourism activity;
- cultural events;
- participants;
- institutions;
- visitor activity.

Sovereign Intervention

- cap changes;
- directional ceilings;
- suspension;
- renewal;

- policy adjustment.
-

38. Evolving the Laboratory Gradually

The Laboratory should itself follow the same staged development philosophy as this concept note.

The immediate focus remains:

Trade Agreement Simulation

followed by:

Rules-of-Origin Simulation

and then progressively:

Distributed Production & Industrialisation Impact

A later module could compare:

Finished Import Scenario

against

Domestic Production

against

TBP In-Country Production

against

TBP Offshore Production

and measure differences in:

- agreement utilisation;
- local value addition;
- SME supplier participation;
- imported-input share;
- origin eligibility;
- regional exports;

- and indicative productive impact.

This should be introduced after the core Laboratory is fully understood.

39. UK–Indonesia as a Case Study

The United Kingdom’s current call for input on deepening trade relationships provides a useful real-world environment in which to test the concept.

Indonesia is one of the markets specifically included in the consultation, and respondents are invited to comment on areas including **Rules of Origin and Origin Procedures**.

The consultation also lists pharmaceuticals, machinery, ICT and electronics, mining, energy, transport, creative industries, hotels and other economic sectors relevant to the wider TBP proposition.

This creates an opportunity to examine a proposed:

UK–Indonesia Distributed Trade & Production Case Study

without suggesting that either government has endorsed the TBP model.

40. Illustrative UK–Indonesia Scenario

The Laboratory could begin with an illustrative:

US\$10 Billion UK–Indonesia Trade Agreement On D Go®

covering:

- goods;
- services;
- pharmaceuticals;
- technology;
- manufacturing;
- minerals and critical minerals;

- tourism;
- cultural exchange;
- SMEs;
- and distributed production.

The model could compare several pathways.

Scenario A — Conventional UK Export

UK production → Indonesia

Scenario B — Joint / Distributed Production

UK inputs + Indonesian inputs → TBP Indonesia → Indonesian market

Scenario C — Regional Production

UK + Indonesian production → TBP Indonesia → ASEAN markets

Scenario D — Neutral Corridor Production

UK + Indonesian inputs → offshore TBP facility → participating markets

subject to explicit Rules-of-Origin and treaty treatment.

41. Why the UK–India Agreement Is a Useful Reference

The UK–India agreement demonstrates that modern trade agreements can provide flexible origin rules while still requiring genuine qualifying production.

The UK Government explains that British manufacturers may continue to use some materials sourced from third countries, while origin rules ensure that only genuinely British or Indian goods receive preferential tariffs.

This supports an important principle for TBP:

Distributed sourcing can be compatible with preferential trade — but only where the applicable Rules of Origin permit it.

TBP's role is therefore not to circumvent Rules of Origin.

It is to explore how they can operate transparently across a more distributed production system.

42. Proposed TBP Neutral Corridor Production & Origin Annex™

Where governments wish to recognise TBP production beyond existing rules, the relevant agreement could contain a dedicated:

TBP Neutral Corridor Production & Origin Annex™

Potential elements include:

- recognised TBP facilities;
- eligible product categories;
- permitted production;
- Rules of Origin;
- cumulation;
- qualifying thresholds;
- customs procedures;
- digital traceability;
- proof of origin;
- verification;
- anti-circumvention;
- data sharing;
- sovereign audit rights;
- suspension mechanisms;
- and treatment of Agreement-Qualifying Corridor Goods™.

This would provide an explicit legal foundation rather than relying on informal interpretation.

43. Institutional Architecture

The model can be understood through five institutional levels.

Sovereign Authorities

Governments, customs authorities, ministries and regulators.

Agreement Governance

Bilateral or multilateral agreement committees.

TBP Neutral Operating Layer

Digital, corridor and coordination infrastructure.

Accredited Operators

Approved production facilities, logistics companies, financial institutions, ports, service providers and other authorised operators.

Verified Economic Participants

SMEs, corporates, manufacturers, exporters, tourism businesses and service companies.

44. TBP Verification vs Sovereign Determination

A crucial distinction should remain throughout the system.

The TBP Laboratory may determine that a product is:

Indicatively Qualifying

but this is not equivalent to a legally binding customs determination.

Formal preferential treatment remains subject to the relevant sovereign customs and regulatory authorities.

This distinction is particularly important for:

- Rules of Origin;
 - pharmaceuticals;
 - food;
 - strategic commodities;
 - dual-use goods;
 - controlled technologies;
 - and critical minerals.
-

45. Strategic Value for Governments

Trade Agreement On D Go® may offer governments:

- predictable aggregate trade exposure;
- real-time utilisation data;
- increased SME visibility;
- dynamic trade monitoring;
- directional balance analysis;
- origin traceability;
- tariff-preference modelling;
- production visibility;
- adaptable agreement management;
- and scenario testing before implementation.

For industrialising governments, it may gradually add another benefit:

the ability to examine how trade demand could support local production capability.

46. Strategic Value for Manufacturers

Manufacturers may eventually benefit from:

- clearer distributed-production rules;
- production closer to demand;
- improved visibility into origin consequences;
- access to approved corridor facilities;
- regional production flexibility;
- local supplier integration;
- reduced reliance on one production location;
- and better resilience.

The system does not remove the commercial risks of international manufacturing.

It provides a framework in which those risks can potentially be managed more transparently.

47. Strategic Value for SMEs

SMEs may gain:

- visibility of available agreement capacity;
- direct access to eligible trade opportunities;
- simplified eligibility information;
- origin guidance;
- potential tariff preferences;
- trade matching;
- logistics connectivity;
- and entry into larger manufacturing supply chains.

The objective is to move SMEs from being peripheral beneficiaries of trade policy toward becoming visible participants within the agreement's economic activity.

48. Strategic Value for Developing and Industrialising Economies

For developing economies, the deeper proposition is not simply:

“export more.”

It is:

“participate in more of the value chain.”

A resource-producing country may therefore progressively move from:

exporting a mineral

to

processing the mineral

to

supplying an industrial component

to

participating in final production

to

serving regional markets.

Similarly, a country importing large volumes of manufactured products may ask whether part of that demand could eventually support:

- domestic assembly;
- local processing;
- joint production;
- supplier development;
- or regional manufacturing.

Trade access can therefore begin to create:

Production Access.

49. Development Sequence

The concept should be developed progressively.

Stage 1 — Government Trade Agreement Laboratory™

Complete the core trade-agreement simulator.

Stage 2 — Rules-of-Origin Architecture

Further develop the four TBP origin pathways.

Stage 3 — Legal & Customs Review

Engage specialist trade, customs and treaty experts.

Stage 4 — Bilateral Case Study

Develop the UK–Indonesia scenario and other comparative cases.

Stage 5 — Government & Industry Consultation

Engage ministries, customs authorities, manufacturers, SMEs and regional bodies.

Stage 6 — Digital Origin Prototype

Develop the TBP Digital Origin & Production Passport™.

Stage 7 — Controlled Pilot

Test limited products, participants, values and facilities.

Stage 8 — Distributed Production Module

Gradually introduce production-location and industrialisation modelling.

Stage 9 — Bilateral / Regional Expansion

Extend successful architecture to wider agreements.

Stage 10 — Neutral Corridor Integration

Connect qualifying agreements across the wider TBP trade ecosystem.

50. The Wider Vision

The longer-term vision is not to replace sovereign trade policy with a borderless system.

It is to build neutral infrastructure through which sovereign trade relationships can operate more dynamically.

A trade agreement would no longer simply be signed and periodically reviewed.

It could become an active economic environment.

SMEs could see where opportunity exists.

Governments could see how their agreement is being used.

Manufacturers could understand the origin consequences of distributed production.

Countries could monitor where value is being created.

Tourism and cultural exchange could become visible parts of the economic relationship.

And, over time, developing economies could examine how market access might translate into greater participation in processing and manufacturing.

51. Core Positioning Statement

TBP Trade Agreement On D Go®

A sovereign-controlled, neutral operating framework for real-time trade, distributed production and cross-border economic exchange.

It brings together:

monetary trade capacity;
SME and corporate participation;
sector utilisation;
Rules of Origin;
distributed manufacturing;
tariff and market-access modelling;
tourism and cultural exchange;
government oversight;
and
sovereign intervention.

Its central principle is:

****Trade where appropriate.**

Produce where advantageous.
Cumulate where agreed.
Preserve origin transparently.
Keep sovereign governments in control.**

52. TBP Origin Doctrine

The proposed TBP origin doctrine can be expressed simply:

Corporate nationality does not automatically determine product origin. TBP neutrality does not erase sovereign jurisdiction. Production location, qualifying inputs, substantial transformation, customs status and the applicable agreement determine origin and eligibility. TBP provides the neutral infrastructure through which those factors can be traced and operationalised across distributed production networks.

From this doctrine emerge:

Origin Continuity™

Preserve legitimate origin during approved transit, storage and limited handling.

Corridor Cumulation™

Allow agreed originating inputs and processing across participating economies to contribute to the applicable origin calculation.

TBP Corridor Production Cumulation™

Recognise qualifying production at agreement-approved TBP facilities located inside participating sovereign territories.

Agreement-Qualifying Corridor Goods™

Provide an explicit sovereign-agreed pathway for recognised production outside participating territories without falsely assigning national origin.

Together these form the:

TBP Neutral Corridor Origin Architecture™

53. Conclusion

Trade Agreement On D Go® begins with a relatively simple proposition:

A trade agreement should be capable of responding dynamically to real trade.

Governments establish the parameters.

Verified traders participate.

Transactions utilise an authorised monetary pool.

Compliance is monitored.

Governments retain control.

That is the foundation.

The concept then responds to another reality of twenty-first-century commerce:

production itself is becoming distributed.

The company, the materials, the processing facility, the final factory and the customer may all be located in different jurisdictions.

Rather than attempting to abolish Rules of Origin, TBP proposes an architecture capable of making those production chains:

traceable, transparent and sovereign-recognised.

This is the purpose of the four-pathway TBP Neutral Corridor Origin Architecture™.

Only once that foundation exists does the wider development opportunity emerge.

If manufacturers can undertake qualifying production closer to their markets while remaining within transparent and sovereign-recognised origin arrangements, then Trade Agreement On D Go® may eventually provide more than market access.

It could also facilitate:

Production Access.

For manufacturers in developed markets, that could mean greater flexibility to locate selected production closer to importing economies and regional customers.

For industrialising economies — particularly across the Global South — it could create a route through which businesses, workers, resources and local suppliers participate progressively in international production networks even before every component of a complete industrial ecosystem exists domestically.

The objective would not be to leave production permanently within external TBP infrastructure.

The greater opportunity is to allow corridor participation to become a bridge toward:

processing;

skills;

supplier development;

local value addition;

manufacturing capability;

regional exports;

and eventually

greater sovereign industrial capacity.

The longer-term proposition can therefore be expressed in three stages:

From Market Access to Production Access.

From Production Access to Industrial Capability.

From Industrial Capability to Global Competitiveness.

Yet the foundation remains deliberately simple:

TBP Trade Agreement On D Go®

A living trade agreement for a world in which trade, production and economic opportunity increasingly move.