BRAND INTELLIGENCE ARTICLE SERIES

How organizations convert everyday interactions into enterprise intelligence.

Interactions → Data → Learning → Intelligence → Advantage

ARTICLE CODE	BI-AR-06
CATEGORY	AI Transformation | Platform Strategy | Global Markets
PILLAR	Agentic Commerce Series (Article 5 of 5)
CHAPTER	Ch. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10

Two Systems, One Framework: Why Agentic Commerce Looks Different in China and the United States[1]

Baohong Sun

Summary: Agentic commerce is emerging simultaneously in the United States and China, but through structurally opposite architectures: a fragmented protocol-based stack in the U.S. versus integrated super-app ecosystems in China. This article introduces the Convergence-Divergence Map to show that five strategic principles from the Brand Intelligence framework — the Flywheel of Intelligence, the Commerce Control Stack, the Delegation Matrix, post-purchase intelligence, and Human-Machine Symbiosis — hold universally across both architectures, while five operational dimensions diverge based on market structure. Comparative analysis of Walmart vs. JD.com, Starbucks vs. Luckin Coffee, and Tesla vs. NIO demonstrates how global brands must build intelligence infrastructure that compounds in any system rather than optimizing for one architectural model.

Keywords: Brand Intelligence; Agentic Commerce; China Digital Commerce; U.S. Digital Commerce; Flywheel of Intelligence; Commerce Control Stack; Super-App; Platform Strategy; Convergence-Divergence Map; Data Sovereignty; Siphon Effect; Put-and-Take Method; User Lifetime Value; ULTV; Command Center; Delegation Matrix; GEO; Tesla; NIO; Walmart; JD.com; Starbucks; Luckin Coffee; Alibaba; Tencent; ByteDance; Google Universal Commerce Protocol

Two Announcements, One Week, Opposite Architectures

In the second week of January 2026, two events captured the emerging architecture of agentic commerce — and the gulf between the world's two largest digital economies.

In New York, at the National Retail Federation conference, Google unveiled the Universal Commerce Protocol backed by more than twenty partners including Shopify, Walmart, Target,

[1] © 2026 Baohong Sun. **Brand Intelligence Article Series**, accompanying *Brand Intelligence: Navigating the Transformation in the AI and Web3 Era* (Springer Nature, 2026). CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.

For Education — Not for Reproduction

Mastercard, and Visa — an open standard designed to stitch together the fragmented layers of AI-mediated shopping across discovery, checkout, and post-purchase.[1] In Hangzhou, Alibaba integrated its Qwen AI assistant directly into Taobao, Alipay, Fliggy, and Amap, enabling consumers to complete purchases, process payments, book travel, and confirm reservations without switching apps — a single ecosystem handling over 400 task types through conversational AI.[2] Within days, ByteDance's Doubao agent, already serving more than 159 million monthly active users, demonstrated the ability to open four competing shopping platforms simultaneously, compare final prices including platform-specific coupons, and present the cheapest option for one-click purchase — all in under thirty seconds.[3]

Same ambition. Same week. Structurally opposite approaches.

To understand what this divergence means for global brands, we first need to see what is actually happening on the ground — who is building what, how consumers are responding, and why the scale of activity has moved well past the experimental stage.

The Landscape: What Is Actually Happening

The velocity of agentic commerce development in the first quarter of 2026 has been extraordinary — and the pattern of activity looks fundamentally different in each market.

The U.S.: Assembling the Stack from Pieces

In the United States, agentic commerce is being built through protocols, partnerships, and parallel experiments. The infrastructure is fragmented by design.

Google launched agentic checkout across Google Search (AI Mode) and Gemini in early 2026, enabling AI agents to execute purchases directly on merchant websites — a "Buy for me" capability now live with selected U.S. retailers.[10] OpenAI embedded checkout directly into ChatGPT through the Agentic Commerce Protocol (ACP), co-developed with Stripe and live since September 2025.[11] Perplexity expanded its AI shopping assistant to more than 5,000 merchants through PayPal integration, then found itself in a federal courtroom when Amazon won a preliminary injunction blocking Perplexity's unauthorized agent access to its marketplace.[12] Amazon, meanwhile, expanded its own Rufus shopping assistant with automatic-buying features — while blocking outside agents from its platform, a defensive move that protects its $56 billion advertising business, which depends on shoppers browsing Amazon's own interface.[13]

The consumer response has been measurable. During the 2025 holiday season, global e-commerce traffic from AI chatbots and browsers doubled compared to 2024.[14] Adobe reported that AI-referred shoppers converted at 31 percent higher rates and delivered 254 percent higher revenue per visit than other traffic sources.[15] McKinsey now estimates $900 billion to $1 trillion in U.S. retail revenue from agentic commerce by 2030.[17]

For Education — Not for Reproduction

Yet the system remains fundamentally fragmented. Each player — Google, OpenAI, Amazon, Stripe, Shopify, Klarna — controls a different layer of the commerce stack. No single company orchestrates the full journey. Brands must maintain structured data feeds, protocol compatibility, and agent-trust signals across each independent system.

Table 1: Who Is Building What — The U.S. Agentic Commerce Landscape, Q1 2026

Builder	Role in the Stack	Key Move (2025–2026)	Brand Implication
Google	Interface + discovery	UCP protocol, "Buy for me" in AI Mode/Gemini	Brands must be structured-data-ready for Google's agent
OpenAI / Stripe	Interface + transaction rails	ACP protocol, ChatGPT checkout	Brands must integrate with new payment flows
Amazon	Marketplace + product graph	Rufus agent expanded; outside agents blocked	Brands inside Amazon face a walled garden; brands outside gain agent access
Perplexity / PayPal	Discovery + checkout	5,000+ merchant integration; legal battles	Third-party agents create new discovery channels but face access resistance
Shopify	Product graph + merchant tools	MCP endpoint on every store by default	Brands on Shopify become automatically agent-visible
Klarna	Product graph + financing	Agentic Product Protocol; 100M+ products indexed	Financing and comparison become agent-mediated

China: Activating Within Integrated Ecosystems

In China, agentic commerce is not being assembled from pieces. It is being activated within ecosystems that already connect payments, social networks, logistics, and marketplaces under unified operators.

Alibaba's Qwen integration across Taobao, Alipay, Fliggy, and Amap enables what the company calls "one-sentence ordering" — a consumer can say "book a hotel near West Lake for next weekend and order Longjing tea to bring as gifts," and the agent handles hotel booking, payment, and a separate merchant purchase in a single conversational flow.[2] Alipay processed 120 million AI-agent transactions in a single week in February 2026.[18]

ByteDance's Doubao, with over 159 million monthly active users, demonstrated a capability that has no current Western equivalent: it opens four competing shopping platforms simultaneously, scans screens, compares final prices including platform-specific coupons, and presents the cheapest option for one-click purchase — all in under thirty seconds.[3]

Tencent is building an AI agent for WeChat's 1.4 billion-MAU mini-program ecosystem — designed to automate ride-hailing, food delivery, grocery shopping, and travel booking through conversational prompts, with gray-box testing planned for mid-2026.[4] JD.com reports that its AI systems already influence approximately 20 percent of gross merchandise value, with more than 50,000 merchants using its JoyStreamer AI-powered livestreaming solution.[7]

Table 2: Who Is Building What — China's Agentic Commerce Landscape, Q1 2026

Builder	Ecosystem Layers Controlled	Key Move (2025–2026)	Brand Implication
Alibaba (Qwen)	Interface + product graph + transaction rails + services	Qwen across Taobao, Alipay, Fliggy, Amap; 400+ task types	Brands on Taobao are automatically agent-accessible — within Alibaba's rules
ByteDance (Doubao)	Interface + cross-platform comparison	159M+ MAUs; opens 4 rival platforms simultaneously	Brands face cross-platform arbitrage that exposes price differences
Tencent (WeChat)	Interface + social graph + mini-program ecosystem	AI agent for 1.4B-MAU ecosystem; gray-box testing mid-2026	Brands with WeChat mini programs become agent-activatable
JD.com	Product graph + logistics + AI merchandising	AI influences ~20% of GMV; 50K+ merchants on JoyStreamer	Brands gain AI-driven distribution — but JD.com's own brands compete
Meituan	Local services + delivery infrastructure	LongCat AI models optimizing delivery network	Service brands face AI-optimized logistics that platforms control

The Chinese consumer base was structurally prepared for this. Mobile payment penetration is near-universal. Five hundred fifteen million Chinese users were already interacting with generative AI tools by mid-2025.[3] The behavioral habits that agentic commerce requires in the U.S. are being built from scratch; in China, they already exist.

The Hype and the Reality

The projections are staggering on both sides — McKinsey's $3–5 trillion global estimate, Morgan Stanley's $190–385 billion U.S. figure.[17] But the gap between protocol announcements and actual consumer behavior remains wide, particularly in the U.S. OpenAI's early attempt at direct in-chat checkout was quietly discontinued in March 2026 after low transaction completion rates. Amazon's courtroom battle with Perplexity reveals that even the most sophisticated AI agents face access barriers when incumbent platforms resist.

In China, the adoption curve is steeper but the dependency risks are deeper. When a single platform controls the agent interface, the product graph, and the payment rails, the brand's margin for strategic independence narrows — and the Siphon Effect (Sun, 2026, Ch. 2) operates with greater force.

The Wrong Comparisons and the Right One

Three conventional wisdoms dominate current analysis of the China-U.S. agentic commerce divergence. Each contains a grain of truth wrapped in a strategic error.

The first is that **China is ahead**. By deployment metrics, this is defensible. But speed of deployment is not the same as structural advantage. China's agentic commerce is activating within ecosystems that already existed; the U.S. is building entirely new protocol infrastructure. The former is faster. It is not necessarily more durable.

The second is that **the super-app model will win globally**. This assumes that what works in China's market conditions will replicate elsewhere. It will not. The U.S. and European markets developed through desktop-first browsing, fragmented payment infrastructure, and antitrust regimes that actively resist the kind of vertical integration that super-apps require.

The third is that **brands should simply follow the local model** and treat the two markets as separate problems. This is the most dangerous error, because it obscures the deeper strategic logic. The Brand Intelligence framework reveals that the principles governing competitive advantage in agentic commerce are the same in both systems. What changes is the operational architecture through which those principles must be executed.

The Convergence-Divergence Map

The clearest way to understand the China-U.S. divergence is to distinguish what converges from what diverges — and to ask why the Brand Intelligence framework predicts both.

Where the Two Systems Converge

Five strategic principles hold regardless of market architecture.

Intelligence accumulation is the compounding asset. The Flywheel of Intelligence — the self-reinforcing loop in which users generate data, data trains algorithms, algorithms improve experiences, and better experiences attract more users — operates identically in both systems (Sun, 2026, Ch. 4). Whether that flywheel spins inside a Taobao super-app or across a fragmented network of Google, Shopify, and Stripe endpoints, the brands that accumulate proprietary behavioral data and train proprietary algorithms build advantage that appreciates rather than depreciates over time.

The Commerce Control Stack determines strategic exposure. As introduced in BI-AR-02 within the Brand Intelligence framework, the Commerce Control Stack maps the five layers through which agentic commerce operates. In both markets, a brand's competitive position depends on which layers of the stack it controls and which are controlled by intermediaries.

Consumer delegation follows behavioral logic, not infrastructure logic. The Delegation Matrix — grounded in the five-stage consumer decision journey (Sun, 2026, Ch. 3) and developed in BI-AR-03 — predicts the same category-level patterns across markets.

Post-purchase intelligence is the decisive competitive asset. The Product-Service-Experience Continuum (Sun, 2026, Ch. 7) and the Put-and-Take Method (Sun, 2026, Ch. 10) describe how this works operationally. Agent-trust equity is built from observed outcomes — and observed outcomes are market-architecture-agnostic.

Human-Machine Symbiosis governs the ceiling. The Command Center architecture — with its balance of algorithmic precision and human creativity, its six properties of

For Education — Not for Reproduction

hyper-personalization, and its dynamic optimization framework — defines the upper bound of what agentic commerce can achieve in any market (Sun, 2026, Ch. 9).

Figure 1: The Convergence-Divergence Map — What Is Universal vs. What Is Architecturally Contingent

CONVERGENCE (Universal Principles)	
Flywheel of Intelligence (Ch. 4) Commerce Control Stack (BI-AR-02) Delegation Matrix (Ch. 3) Post-Purchase Intelligence (Ch. 7, 10) Human-Machine Symbiosis / Command Center (Ch. 9)	These five principles operate identically in both fragmented (U.S.) and integrated (China) architectures. They define *what* drives competitive advantage.
DIVERGENCE (Architecture-Dependent)	
U.S. / Europe • Fragmented stack • Coordination risk • Build-your-own sovereignty • Cross-agent trust aggregation • Steps 1 + 2 simultaneously	**China** • Integrated stack (super-apps) • Concentration risk • Intelligence-within-ecosystem • Platform-specific trust silos • Step 2 activating on Step 1 base

Where the Two Systems Diverge

Five structural differences produce fundamentally different operational challenges for brands.

Stack architecture: fragmented vs. integrated. In the U.S. and Europe, the Commerce Control Stack is distributed across independent players. In China, super-apps collapse three to four layers under a single operator.

Table 3: The Commerce Control Stack — Who Owns What in Each Market

Stack Layer	U.S. / Europe	China
1. User Interface & Intent	Fragmented: Google AI Mode, ChatGPT, Perplexity, Siri	Consolidated: Qwen (Alibaba), Doubao (ByteDance), WeChat AI (Tencent)
2. Decision Logic	Distributed across independent agents; no single orchestrator	Embedded within super-app algorithms; platform controls recommendation logic
3. Product Graph	Split: Shopify, Klarna, Amazon (walled), brand websites	Integrated: Taobao, JD.com, Douyin Mall — each platform owns its graph
4. Transaction Rails	Fragmented: Stripe, PayPal, Apple Pay, bank cards	Consolidated: Alipay, WeChat Pay — near-universal mobile payment
5. Post-Purchase	Brand-owned (if brands invest); otherwise fragmented	Partially platform-mediated; delivery, reviews, returns within ecosystem
Primary Brand Risk	Coordination — absent from a critical layer	Concentration — absorbed by platform controlling multiple layers

Chapter 8 of *Brand Intelligence* anticipated this divergence through the concept of the mobile app as Super Touchpoint and Super Transmitter (Sun, 2026). The super-app is the extreme

realization of Module 7's dual function. The difference between the U.S. and China is not in what the mobile app does. It is in who owns it.

Primary brand risk: coordination vs. concentration. In fragmented systems, brands risk being absent from a critical layer. In integrated systems, brands risk being absorbed by the platform that controls multiple layers simultaneously. The Siphon Effect (Sun, 2026, Ch. 2) is structurally stronger in integrated ecosystems.

Data sovereignty takes different forms. In the U.S., sovereignty means building owned infrastructure to escape fragmented dependencies. In China, sovereignty means building proprietary analytical intelligence within ecosystem boundaries to resist platform absorption (Sun, 2026, Ch. 1, 4).

Agent-trust equity formation. In the U.S., a brand earns agent-trust equity across multiple independent agents and can potentially aggregate that trust. In China, trust metrics are platform-specific and often non-portable. The ULTV model (Sun, 2026, Ch. 3) must be evaluated per ecosystem in China, whereas in the U.S. it can be aggregated across a brand's own data infrastructure.

The Two-Step Process runs at different speeds. China completed Step 1 (Digital Transformation) earlier, making Step 2 (Intelligent Activation) faster to deploy. The U.S. is attempting both steps simultaneously through protocol standardization.

Three Companies, Two Systems

Comparative evidence illustrates how the convergence-divergence map operates in practice.

Walmart vs. JD.com — Retail intelligence at scale. Both companies are building Command Center architectures. Walmart navigates the fragmented U.S. stack by deploying its own Sparky assistant while simultaneously integrating with Google's Gemini and OpenAI's ChatGPT.[6] JD.com operates within China's integrated ecosystem, where its AI systems already influence approximately 20 percent of GMV.[7] The Flywheel of Intelligence spins in both cases. The operational architecture differs — Walmart must coordinate intelligence across independent layers; JD.com must extract sovereignty from within an integrated ecosystem.

Starbucks vs. Luckin Coffee — The mobile-first brand ecosystem. Starbucks is one of the few Western brands whose mobile app approaches the Super Touchpoint model described in Chapter 8. Luckin Coffee was born inside the Chinese super-app environment: near-100 percent mobile ordering across more than 24,000 stores, AI-driven dynamic pricing that reduced waste by 18 percent, and $870 million in Q1 2026 quarterly revenue (+41.5% YoY).[19,20]

Table 4: Starbucks vs. Luckin Coffee — Mobile-First Brand Ecosystems

For Education — Not for Reproduction

Dimension	Starbucks	Luckin Coffee
Ecosystem Model	Brand-owned Super Touchpoint (Ch. 8)	Born inside super-app ecosystem (WeChat, Alipay)
Mobile Ordering	~30% of U.S. transactions via app	Near-100% mobile; completely cashier-less
Data Sovereignty	Full: owns data pipeline end to end	Partial: shares distribution/payment data with ecosystem partners
AI Application	Personalized offers, loyalty optimization	Dynamic pricing (18% waste reduction), demand forecasting
Scale (Q1 2026)	~38,000 stores globally	24,000+ stores; $870M quarterly revenue (+41.5% YoY)
Strategic Trade-off	Slower innovation, higher sovereignty	Faster scaling, higher Siphon Effect exposure

Tesla vs. NIO — Two models of platform intelligence. This pairing is the most revealing, because both companies sell smart electric vehicles in both markets — but they build their intelligence architectures through fundamentally different strategies.

Tesla operates identically in Shanghai and San Francisco: proprietary data infrastructure, over-the-air updates, direct customer relationships, and a continuous feedback loop between product usage and algorithmic improvement. Its fleet logged over one billion miles in the first fifty days of 2026 alone.[8] Tesla owns every layer of its commerce stack.

NIO takes a structurally different approach. Rather than building an isolated product-intelligence loop, NIO constructed a community-centered ecosystem — what its founder William Li describes as a "user enterprise" (BI-CS-03). NIO's mobile app serves nearly seven million registered users and more than 600,000 daily active users — a community that far outscales its ownership base of roughly 714,000 cumulative vehicle deliveries.[21]

Table 5: Tesla vs. NIO — Two Models of Platform Intelligence

Dimension	Tesla	NIO
Flywheel Entry Point	Product-centric (vehicle as sensor array)	Community-centric (user as ecosystem participant)
Primary Data Source	Driving behavior, sensor data, usage telemetry	Social interaction, lifestyle preferences, advocacy patterns
ULTV Weighting	Data value dominant (1B+ miles in 50 days)	Social value dominant (25 referral sales per active member)
Community Data (Ch. 5)	Limited to product feedback	All five categories: behavioral, social network, sentiment, content, identity
Stack Ownership	Owns every layer end to end	Owns community + product layers; shares payment/distribution
Market Architecture	Identical in both U.S. and China	Deeper ecosystem integration in China; community model travels globally
Intelligence Model	Proprietary and closed	Participatory and co-created

Both approaches demonstrate that the intelligence-over-interface principle holds across architectures. Neither company is building a shopping agent. Both are building proprietary intelligence infrastructure that compounds with every interaction.

What Global Brands Must Get Right in Both Systems

Four strategic imperatives apply across architectures. The execution differs; the principle does not.

Table 6: Four Strategic Imperatives — Same Principle, Different Execution

Imperative	Universal Principle	U.S. Execution	China Execution
Build intelligence, not interface	Flywheel of Intelligence (Ch. 4)	Structured data feeds across multiple agents; GEO; Command Center consolidation	Proprietary algorithms within super-app boundaries; make intelligence portable
Execute Put-and-Take	Public domain → Private domain (Ch. 10)	"Put" across fragmented channels; "Take" routes to owned properties	Both within same super-app; engineer brand-identified relationships within ecosystem
Design for 3 forms of brand strength	Consumer + Machine + Agent-trust equity (BI-AR-02)	Cross-ecosystem brand signals carry more weight	Platform-specific metrics dominate: JD.com scores, Douyin engagement, Taobao conversion
Protect data sovereignty	User & Data Sovereignty (Ch. 1, 4)	Build owned infrastructure to aggregate across fragmented sources	Build proprietary analytical capability within ecosystem constraints

Build the intelligence, not the interface — everywhere. In the U.S., this means structured data feeds that serve multiple agents, a Command Center architecture (CDP + ADC) that consolidates learning across fragmented touchpoints, and Generative Engine Optimization (GEO; Sun, 2026, Ch. 10). In China, it means proprietary algorithms and first-party analytical capability within super-app boundaries.

Execute the Put-and-Take Method — but calibrate the mechanics. In the U.S., the "put" happens across fragmented channels; the "take" routes users into owned digital properties. In China, both may occur within the same super-app. The brand must engineer the conversion from platform-mediated interaction to brand-identified relationship within ecosystem boundaries.

Design for three forms of brand strength — weighted differently by market. Both systems require consumer-facing equity, machine-facing equity, and agent-trust equity (BI-AR-02). In the U.S., cross-ecosystem brand signals carry more weight. In China, platform-specific agent-trust metrics may matter more than aggregate brand awareness.

Protect data sovereignty with architecturally appropriate strategies. The Command Center's strategic value is what it produces — predictive intelligence, dynamic optimization, hyper-personalized marketing commands — not necessarily where the raw data physically

resides.

Forward Look: Three Signals of Convergence

The fragmented and integrated models may converge over the next two to three years.

First, **cross-ecosystem interoperability in China.** If Alibaba, Tencent, or ByteDance adopt open protocols that enable agents to operate across super-app boundaries, China's Commerce Control Stack would fragment toward the U.S. model.[4]

Second, **super-app emergence in the West.** Apple's integration of Siri, Apple Pay, App Store, and Apple Intelligence could create a de facto super-app layer in the U.S. and Europe.

Third, **regulatory convergence.** China's PIPL and the U.S.'s evolving state-level privacy laws are both tightening constraints on data collection and algorithmic decision-making.

The Brand Intelligence framework predicts that regardless of architectural convergence, the strategic logic holds: the Flywheel of Intelligence, the Command Center, the Put-and-Take Method, and the intelligence accumulation principle define competitive advantage in agentic commerce — whether the commerce stack is fragmented or integrated, whether the market is Shenzhen or Seattle.

The brands that understand this will not optimize for one system. They will build the intelligence infrastructure that compounds in any system — and treat the architectural differences not as strategic obstacles, but as the operating conditions within which a universal logic of brand intelligence applies.

Cross-References

Brand Intelligence Ch. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10

BI-AR-02: When AI Agents Start Shopping

BI-AR-03: What Consumers Will and Won't Delegate

BI-AR-04: When Agents Negotiate

BI-AR-05: The Profit Model Shift

BI-CS-03: NIO Community Ecosystem

BI-CS-04: Walmart Enterprise Intelligence

References

1. Google, "New Tech and Tools for Retailers to Succeed in an Agentic Shopping Era," Google Blog, January 11, 2026.

or Education — Not for Reproduction

2. Caixin Global, “Alibaba Integrates AI Chatbot With Taobao, Alipay,” January 16, 2026.
3. CNBC, “Chinese Tech Giants Enter the ‘Agentic Commerce’ Race as AI Reshapes Super Apps,” January 21, 2026.
4. NAI 500, “Tencent Secretly Develops WeChat AI Agent, Targeting Mini-Program Ecosystem with 1.4 Billion Monthly Active Users,” March 2026.
5. Bird & Bird, “China Data Protection and Cybersecurity: Annual Review of 2025 and Outlook for 2026,” January 2026.
6. Walmart, “Walmart and Google Turn AI Discovery Into Effortless Shopping Experiences,” January 11, 2026.
7. Caixin Global, “E-Commerce Giants Step Up AI Rollouts to Boost Sales,” December 5, 2025.
8. Tesla, Inc., Fleet API Documentation and Q4 2025 Earnings Report; IEEE Spectrum, “Tesla Autopilot Data Scope,” 2025.
9. Sun, Baohong. *Brand Intelligence: Navigating the Transformation in the AI and Web3 Era.* Springer Nature, 2026.
10. Sanbi AI, “Agentic Shopping 2026: How Google UCP & ChatGPT Instant Checkout Are Replacing Search,” 2026.
11. Stripe, “Developing an Open Standard for Agentic Commerce,” Stripe Blog, 2025.
12. CNBC, “Amazon Wins Court Order to Block Perplexity’s AI Shopping Agent,” March 10, 2026.
13. Modern Retail, “Why the AI Shopping Agent Wars Will Heat Up in 2026,” January 2026.
14. Salesforce, Holiday Shopping Season 2025 data; cited in commercetools, “7 AI Trends Shaping Agentic Commerce in 2026.”
15. Adobe, “Holiday Shopping Season Drove a Record $257.8 Billion Online,” January 2026.
16. Previsible, “Agentic Shopping: How AI Is Transforming Ecommerce in 2026.”
17. McKinsey, “The Agentic Commerce Opportunity,” October 2025.
18. Ivinco, “China Is Already Living in the Agentic Commerce Future,” 2026.
19. GrowthHQ, “How Luckin Coffee’s App-Driven Personalization Fuels Its Dominance,” 2025.
20. Luckin Coffee Inc., Q1 2026 Earnings Report; Success Magazine, “Luckin Coffee Arrives in the U.S.,” 2026.
21. NIO Inc., 2024 Annual Results and Q1 2025 Delivery Data; BI-CS-03: NIO Community Ecosystem Case Study (Sun, 2026).

© 2026 Baohong Sun. All rights reserved.

The Brand Intelligence framework, Brandnetics™, Commerce Control Stack, Convergence-Divergence Map, Delegation Matrix, Flywheel of Intelligence, Siphon Effect, Put-and-Take Method, Super Touchpoint, Super Transmitter, User Lifetime Value (ULTV), Generative Engine Optimization (GEO), and related concepts presented in this work are the intellectual property of Baohong Sun, as published in *Brand Intelligence: Navigating the Transformation in the AI and Web3 Era* (Springer Nature, 2026).
https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-032-17490-6

Published on brand-ai.org. Any use, citation, or adaptation of these frameworks requires proper attribution to the original source. License: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.