The Structural Digitization of Capital Markets

Market Structure Transition
in the Era of Digital Asset Infrastructure

Matthew Anderson
Anderson One Strategic Group
April 2026

Disclaimer

This publication has been prepared and distributed by **Anderson One Strategic Group, LLC,** a Tennessee limited liability company ("A1 Strategic," "Anderson One Strategic," or the "Firm") for informational and educational purposes only.

Anderson One Strategic is a strategic advisory firm. The Firm is **not registered as an investment adviser with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, with any state securities authority or any other jurisdiction**, and it does not provide investment advisory services. The Firm does not manage client assets, does not provide individualized investment advice, does not act as a broker-dealer, and does not execute securities or digital asset transactions on behalf of clients.

Nothing contained in this publication constitutes, or should be construed as, investment advice, legal advice, tax advice, accounting advice, or a recommendation or solicitation to buy, sell, or hold any security, digital asset, derivative, or other financial instrument. This publication does not constitute an offer to provide advisory services in any jurisdiction where such offer would be unlawful or would require registration.

The analysis presented herein reflects the views of the author as of the date of publication and is subject to change without notice. The information contained in this document has been obtained from sources believed to be reliable; however, Anderson One Strategic makes no representation or warranty, express or implied, as to its accuracy, completeness, or reliability. No liability is accepted for any direct or consequential loss arising from reliance on this publication.

Any forward-looking statements are inherently subject to uncertainty, risk, and change. Market structure developments, regulatory outcomes, institutional adoption patterns, and technological evolution may differ materially from those described herein. References to potential efficiency gains, infrastructure developments, or regulatory convergence are analytical observations and not guarantees of future performance or outcomes.

Digital assets and distributed ledger technologies involve significant risks, including but not limited to price volatility, liquidity constraints, technological vulnerabilities, cybersecurity threats, regulatory uncertainty, legal classification risk, operational failure, and valuation complexity. Readers are solely responsible for conducting their own independent due diligence and for consulting with their own legal, regulatory, tax, accounting, and investment professionals before making any financial or strategic decision.

This publication is intended for institutional, professional, or sophisticated readers capable of evaluating its contents independently. It is not intended for retail investment audiences.

No fiduciary relationship is created by receipt or review of this publication. Any strategic advisory engagement with Anderson One Strategic is governed solely by a written agreement executed between the Firm and its client.

By accessing or reviewing this publication, the reader acknowledges and agrees to the foregoing limitations.

Executive Summary

Digital assets are often framed as a speculative asset class. This characterization understates their significance. More accurately, they represent an ongoing infrastructure experiment within capital markets.

Over the past decade, financial systems have undergone meaningful modernization across execution, settlement, and custody. These improvements have reduced friction, increased speed, and expanded access. However, as these systems scale across jurisdictions, counterparties, and regulatory regimes, a different constraint is emerging.

The primary limitation is no longer execution efficiency.

It is coordination.

Financial systems must now operate across fragmented regulatory environments, heterogeneous identity frameworks, and distributed liquidity pools. This introduces a requirement not just to execute transactions efficiently, but to determine whether transactions are valid under dynamic and often conflicting constraints.

These developments are occurring alongside measurable shifts in settlement infrastructure, regulatory convergence, and institutional experimentation with tokenized systems [1][3][10].

This paper introduces the concept of the **coordination layer**—an emerging architectural component of financial infrastructure responsible for maintaining coherence across identity, liquidity, and regulatory conditions.

The development of this layer depends on new verification mechanisms, including privacy-preserving technologies such as zero-knowledge proofs, and attestation-based trust frameworks. Together, these systems enable institutions to validate conditions without requiring full data disclosure.

Digital asset infrastructure, viewed through this lens, is not simply a new asset class. It is a system-level response to the coordination requirements of modern capital markets.

Section 1: Market Structure Digitization

Financial market evolution has historically occurred through successive layers of infrastructure development rather than wholesale replacement. From physical settlement processes to electronic trading systems, each phase has introduced increased efficiency while preserving core structural functions.

Digital asset infrastructure should be understood within this continuum. Rather than representing a parallel system, it reflects the ongoing digitization of market structure itself. Distributed ledgers, tokenized assets, and programmable settlement mechanisms are extensions of existing financial architecture, not departures from it.

Early interpretations of digital assets focused on disintermediation and disruption. However, institutional adoption patterns suggest a different trajectory—one characterized by integration, interoperability, and incremental system redesign.

If digital assets are best understood as infrastructure evolution, the relevant question becomes not what is being built, but what limitations in the current system are necessitating that buildout.

Section 2: Infrastructure Modernization

Considerable progress has already been made in modernizing financial infrastructure.

Settlement cycles have compressed, with markets moving toward T+1 and, in some cases, exploring atomic or near-instant settlement [1][2]. Custody solutions have matured to support institutional-grade asset protection, although accounting and capital treatment remain under active development [9]. Execution environments have become increasingly efficient, supported by algorithmic-routing, API-based connectivity, and continuous market access.

These developments represent a meaningful advancement over legacy systems. They reduce operational friction and improve the speed and reliability of transactions.

However, these improvements share a common characteristic: they are execution-centric.

They optimize how transactions are processed, routed, and settled. They do not fundamentally address how systems determine whether transactions should occur under complex, multi-dimensional constraints.

As a result, while infrastructure modernization has progressed significantly, it is approaching a point of diminishing returns.

Section 3: The Limits of Execution-Centric Systems

As financial systems expand in scope and complexity, the limitations of execution-focused architecture become increasingly clear.

Routing optimization, once a primary source of efficiency gains, is reaching a plateau. Systems can identify optimal paths for execution, but they remain constrained by external conditions that are not fully integrated into the decision-making process.

Liquidity is increasingly fragmented across jurisdictions, asset classes, and platforms. Regulatory requirements vary across regions [3][4]. These constraints cannot be resolved through execution logic alone, as they are structural features of the global financial system rather than inefficiencies in transaction routing [5]. Identity frameworks are still inconsistent, requiring repeated verification across counterparties and institutions.

Most critically, data-sharing requirements introduce structural friction. Institutions are often required to disclose sensitive information to validate transactions, creating tension between coordination and confidentiality.

These factors reveal a deeper structural limitation.

The core challenge is no longer how efficiently transactions can be executed.

It is how reliably systems can coordinate under dynamic and often conflicting constraints.

As systems expand across jurisdictions, counterparties, and regulatory frameworks, the limiting factor is no longer execution efficiency, but the ability to maintain coherence across identity, liquidity, and compliance conditions.

This shift introduces a requirement for a different type of infrastructure—one capable of verifying conditions without requiring unrestricted data exchange.

Section 4: Verification Infrastructure and Coordination

Traditional financial systems rely on disclosure-based verification models. To validate identity, compliance status, or financial conditions, institutions must access underlying data. This approach introduces inefficiencies, increases operational risk, and conflicts with privacy and confidentiality requirements.

An alternative model is emerging based on verification rather than disclosure. This model is aligned with broader experimentation across central banks and financial institutions exploring programmable and privacy-preserving financial infrastructure [6].

Zero-knowledge proofs enable one party to validate a statement without revealing the underlying data. In financial contexts, this allows institutions to verify identity attributes, compliance status, or asset sufficiency without exposing sensitive information.

However, verification alone is insufficient. Systems must also determine which claims are credible.

This issue is addressed through attestation-based frameworks, in which trusted institutions issue verifiable claims regarding identity, compliance, or eligibility. These attestations establish a hierarchy of trust based on source credibility, jurisdiction, and recency.

The combination of attestation systems and zero-knowledge proofs creates a new form of verification infrastructure. Attestations define who is trusted, while zero-knowledge proofs define what can be verified without disclosure.

Together, they enable financial systems to operate on validated conditions rather than shared datasets.

The ability to verify conditions without requiring data disclosure introduces a new architectural primitive within financial systems. As verification becomes decoupled from data exchange, coordination itself begins to emerge as a distinct layer of infrastructure.

Section 5: The Emergence of the Coordination Layer

The coordination layer represents a distinct architectural layer within financial systems.

Rather than focusing solely on execution, this layer is responsible for evaluating constraints and maintaining system coherence across multiple dimensions, including identity, liquidity, and regulatory conditions.

In this model, transactions are no longer initiated solely based on availability and routing efficiency. Instead, they are conditional on the validation of multiple, interdependent factors.

Execution becomes a downstream consequence of validated conditions.

The coordination layer integrates inputs from identity systems, liquidity sources, regulatory frameworks, and execution environments, reflecting broader institutional exploration into tokenization and system-level integration [10][11].

It evaluates whether a given transaction is permissible, consistent, and valid within the context of these constraints.

This represents a structural shift from systems that optimize for efficiency to systems that optimize for validity.

Section 6: Institutional Implications of the Coordination Layer

The emergence of a coordination layer redefines how capital is evaluated, regulated, and deployed across financial systems.

Institutional Investors and Asset Managers

Digital asset integration depends less on asset-level characteristics and more on infrastructure readiness, custody reliability, and governance frameworks [12].

The ability to assess system validity, counterparty reliability, and regulatory compliance becomes central to allocation decisions.

Regulators

Regulatory oversight is shifting from entity-based supervision toward system-level validation, particularly as jurisdictions continue to formalize digital asset frameworks and market structure integration [4][8].

Verification mechanisms that reduce reliance on raw data disclosure could improve auditability while preserving confidentiality.

Financial Institutions

Coordination capability rather than execution efficiency will increasingly define competitive advantage.

Institutions that operate across fragmented systems while maintaining coherence will better secure their positioning in a digitized market structure.

In this environment, coordination becomes the defining capability of modern financial infrastructure.

Conclusion: Infrastructure Before Allocation

Digital asset infrastructure should not be evaluated through the lens of price or short-term market dynamics. Its significance lies in its role as a system-level response to coordination challenges in modern capital markets.

The emergence of verification-based systems and coordination-focused architecture suggests a broader transition in how financial systems are designed and operated.

In this context, strategic engagement requires a clear understanding of infrastructure readiness, system constraints, and the conditions under which coordination becomes viable.

Allocation decisions, therefore, should follow—not precede—this understanding.

Infrastructure precedes allocation.

Selected References

(1) U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission – *T+1 Settlement Cycle Rule (2023)*

(2) Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation – *Settlement Optimization & Post-Trade Infrastructure Reports*

(3) Bank for International Settlements – *Annual Economic Report*

(4) European Union – *Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA)*

(5) International Monetary Fund – *Global Financial Stability Report*

(6) Bank for International Settlements – Innovation Hub – *Project Mariana; Project Helvetia*

(7) Bank for International Settlements – *OTC Derivatives Statistics*

(8) Basel Committee on Banking Supervision – *Prudential Treatment of Cryptoasset Exposures*

(9) U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission – *Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121*

(10) World Economic Forum – *Tokenization of Assets Report*

(11) International Monetary Fund – *Tokenization and Financial Market Infrastructure Research*

(12) Fidelity Digital Assets – *Institutional Investor Digital Asset Study*

Anderson One Strategic Group is a strategic advisory firm focused on market structure evolution, regulatory positioning, and integrating digital financial infrastructure.

We work with institutions navigating the transition toward programmable, constraint-aware financial systems.

Engagements are selective and initiated through direct inquiry.

Anderson One Strategic Group

Strategic Advisory

Tennessee, United States

Institutional inquiries

Matthew@AndersonOneStrategic.com

www.AndersonOneStrategic.com