3. Architectural Motivation

Go to Top

Centralised financial platforms create political and architectural tension when they concentrate data custody, processing authority, interpretation, access control, settlement support, compliance evidence, and market visibility in a single institution or platform operator.

This concentration creates several concerns:

- Jurisdictions may resist loss of local authority
- Regulators may resist opaque platform governance
- Participants may resist dependency on a dominant multinational operator
- Smaller providers may lack practical access to infrastructure roles
- Cost structures may remain hidden inside spreads, fees, or bundled pricing
- Under-compliance may appear cheaper than compliant processing
- Data residency and data sovereignty requirements may conflict with centralised processing
- Buyers may lack the time and expertise to assess each candidate component independently
- Integrators may lack a common basis for comparing deployment-ready components

Blockchain and crypto-economic models address centralisation by distributing ledger state, validator participation, or token incentives. Those models do not address the full institutional problem. Regulated financial infrastructure needs qualified participants, accountable providers, evidence-linked work records, policy-governed processing, jurisdictional eligibility, ordinary accounting treatment, and visible non-functional assurance.

The Governed Node Service Market addresses the problem differently. It distributes governed work to eligible participants while preserving shared semantics, policy, evidence, compensation, qualification, and governance discipline.