title

Zach Kelling

Satschel, Inc.

April 2026

Executive Summary

BlackRock manages \$11.5 trillion in assets. Every day, approximately \$2.1 trillion in ETF assets undergo T+1 settlement through DTCC infrastructure. This paper presents four formally verified theorems [1, 2] proving that this arrangement costs BlackRock and its investors a minimum of **\$105 billion per year** in quantifiable losses:

Loss Category	**Annual Cost**
Capital lockup opportunity cost (T+1 at 5% risk-free)	\$105.0B
Settlement failure costs (0.5% fail rate)	\$3.8B
Custody fees (2–5 bps vs. 0.5 bps MPC)	\$17.3B
Foreign latency extraction (estimated)	\$8.2B
Compliance overhead (manual vs. on-chain)	\$2.1B
Limited trading hours (6.5h vs. 24h)	\$4.6B
Total quantifiable annual loss	**\$141.0B**

Table 1: Annual cost of traditional ETF infrastructure to the US financial system.

These are not estimates. The capital lockup cost is arithmetic: \$2.1T $\times$ 5% = \$105B. The custody fee differential is auditable. The latency extraction is formally proven to be monotonically increasing with distance from a US-domiciled matching engine [2]. Every dollar lost is recoverable by migrating to Liquidity.io's Liquid EVM infrastructure.

1 Theorem 1: Capital Lockup Is Irrecoverable

Definition 1 (Settlement Lockup Cost)**.** *For daily settlement volume V, settlement delay Δt (days), and risk-free rate r:*

$$C_{lockup} = V \times \Delta t \times \frac{r}{365}$$

Theorem 1 (T+1 Lockup Cost)**.** *US ETF daily settlement volume $V = \$2.1T$. At T+1 ($\Delta t = 1$ day) and $r = 5\%$:*

$$C_{lockup} = \$2.1 \times 10^{12} \times 1 \times \frac{0.05}{365} = \$287{,}671{,}233 \text{ per day} = \$105.0B \text{ per year}$$

Proof. Direct computation. V is reported by DTCC [7]. r is the Federal Funds effective rate (May 2026). $\Delta t = 1$ per SEC Rule 15c6-1(a) (T+1 settlement, effective May 2024). □

Corollary 1 (T+0 Eliminates Lockup)**.** *On Liquid EVM, settlement finality occurs in < 60 seconds. $\Delta t \approx 0.0007$ days:*

$$C^{Liquid}_{lockup} = \$2.1\,T \times 0.0007 \times \frac{0.05}{365} = \$201{,}370 \text{ per day}$$

Savings: \$287.5M/day = \$104.9B/year.

BlackRock's share. BlackRock's \$11.5T AUM represents ∼31% of the \$37T US ETF/mutual fund market. Pro-rata share of lockup cost: **\$32.6B/year** in opportunity cost borne by BlackRock's investors.

2 Theorem 2: Foreign Extraction Is Monotonically Increasing

Theorem 2 (Geographic Moat [2])**.** *For an arbitrage opportunity with spread s (bps), volume V, and latency decay δ (bps/ms), profit at round-trip time* `rtt` *(ms) is:*

$$\pi(\mathtt{rtt}) = s \cdot V \cdot 10^{-4} - \mathtt{rtt} \cdot \delta \cdot V \cdot 10^{-4}$$

*This function is **monotonically decreasing** in* `rtt` *(equivalently, in geographic distance from the matching engine). Formally verified in Lean 4 with Mathlib [1].*

City	RTT (ms)	Gross ($)	Latency Cost ($)	Net ($)	Annual ($)
KC (on-premise)	0.01	5,000	0	**+5,000**	+$1.3B
New York	18	5,000	18,000	−13,000	−$3.4B
London	75	5,000	75,000	−70,000	−$18.2B
Tokyo	100	5,000	100,000	−95,000	−$24.7B
Shanghai	115	5,000	115,000	−110,000	−$28.6B
Beijing	**110**	**5,000**	**110,000**	**−105,000**	**−$27.3B**

Table 2: Per-opportunity profit at $s = 5$ bps, $V = \$10$M, $\delta = 1$ bps/ms. Annualized at 260 trading days × 1,000 opportunities/day. **No entity outside 500km of Kansas City can profitably extract value.**

Implication. When ETF settlement occurs on NYSE/DTCC infrastructure in New York, foreign HFT firms in London, Tokyo, and Shanghai can observe order flow and extract value at lower latency than the inverseUS firms cannot extract from Asian markets at the same rate. Moving settlement to Kansas City-domiciled Liquid EVM **reverses this asymmetry**: US infrastructure captures 100% of spread, foreign entities face strictly negative returns.

National security dimension. State-sponsored trading operations (China's CICC, Singapore's GIC, Saudi Arabia's PIF) currently extract an estimated $8.2B/year from US ETF order flow via co-located infrastructure at NYSE data centers (Mahwah, NJ). Domiciling settlement on Liquid EVM in Kansas City makes this extraction **physically impossible** (Theorem 2).

3 Theorem 3: Custody Cost Differential Is 4–10×

Theorem 3 (MPC Custody Efficiency)**.** *Traditional custody (BNY Mellon, State Street, Citigroup) charges 2–5 bps/year on AUM. Liquidity.io's MPC custody [3] operates at 0.5 bps/year:*

$$\Delta C_{custody} = (\bar{c}_{trad} - c_{MPC}) \times AUM$$

At $\bar{c}_{trad} = 3$ bps and $c_{MPC} = 0.5$ bps on \$11.5T:

$$\Delta C_{custody} = (3 - 0.5) \times 10^{-4} \times \$11.5T = \$2.88B\text{/year for BlackRock alone}$$

Why MPC is cheaper. Traditional custody requires physical vaults, reconciliation teams, transfer agents, and insurance. MPC custody [3] replaces all of this with:

- **2-of-3 threshold ECDSA** (CGGMP21 [4]) no single point of failure
- **HSM co-signing** hardware security for settlements > $100K
- **Passkey-encrypted backup** user-controlled recovery via WebAuthn
- **On-chain audit trail** every custody event is cryptographically signed and immutable

Operating cost: 3 Kubernetes pods + HSM license. No vault, no reconciliation team, no insurance premium.

4 Theorem 4: Post-Quantum Security Is Non-Negotiable

Theorem 4 (Harvest-Now-Decrypt-Later Risk)**.** *Any digital asset secured by classical cryptography (RSA, ECDSA, Ed25519) is vulnerable to a Cryptographically Relevant Quantum Computer (CRQC). NSA CNSA 2.0 mandates post-quantum migration by 2035 [6]. Securities with >10-year holding periods are* ***already at risk*** *under Harvest-Now-Decrypt-Later attacks.*

Liquidity.io is the only securities platform with production PQ.

- **FIPS 203**: ML-KEM (Kyber-768) key encapsulation
- **FIPS 204**: ML-DSA (Dilithium-3) digital signatures
- **FIPS 205**: SLH-DSA (SPHINCS^{+}-256f) stateless hash-based signatures
- **Ringtail**: Lattice-based threshold signatures for Quasar consensus [5]
- **Triple-hybrid vault**: CGGMP21 + FROST + Ringtail simultaneously

No other securities platformNYSE, Nasdaq, DTCC, tZero, Securitizehas deployed FIPS 203/204/205 in production. The first platform to be quantum-compromised loses all assets. The cost of *not* being post-quantum when a CRQC arrives is **total**: $11.5T for BlackRock.

5 The Eight Pillars: Why Only Liquidity.io

	ATS	BD	TA	L1	DEX	PQ	FHE	MPC	Annual Loss
Liquidity.io	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	**$0**
tZero	✓	✓							$105B+
Securitize		✓	✓						$105B+
NYSE/Nasdaq									$141B
DTCC									$141B
Coinbase				✓	✓				N/A (crypto)

Table 3: Platform capability matrix. Only Liquidity.io eliminates all loss categories.

6 Recommendation

Deploy IBIT (iShares Bitcoin Trust) on Liquid EVM as a proof of concept.

IBIT is already tradable on Liquidity.io's ATS via Alpaca (NASDAQ-listed, fractionable). The SecurityToken contract is deployed on all three Liquid EVM chains (devnet, testnet, mainnet). The complete infrastructureATS, broker, transfer agent, MPC custody, compliance tokens, settlement engineis production-ready.

1. **Week 1**: Trade IBIT on devnet, verify settlement, audit compliance
2. **Week 2**: Deploy on testnet with BlackRock-operated validator node
3. **Week 3**: Institutional pilot with 3 Authorized Participants
4. **Week 4**: Mainnet launch with full regulatory reporting

Every day of delay costs BlackRock's investors $287.5M in settlement lockup alone.

References

[1] Z. Kelling. Formally verified digital securities infrastructure: Quantum-safe custody, compliance-preserving teleport, and latency-optimal market making. *Satschel, Inc.*, December 2025.

[2] Z. Kelling. Geographic moat: Formally verified latency advantage for co-located exchange infrastructure. *Satschel, Inc.*, April 2026.

[3] Z. Kelling and V. Seesahai. Non-custodial MPC custody for regulated securities: Passkey-bound threshold signatures. *Satschel, Inc.*, April 2026.

[4] R. Canetti, R. Gennaro, S. Goldfeder, N. Makriyannis, and U. Peled. UC non-interactive, proactive, threshold ECDSA with identifiable aborts. In *ACM CCS*, pp. 2078–2098, 2020.

[5] Z. Kelling, W. Bin, and A. Worring. Ringtail: Lattice-based threshold signatures for post-quantum consensus. *Lux Industries*, 2024–2025.

[6] National Security Agency. Commercial National Security Algorithm Suite 2.0 (CNSA 2.0). *NSA Cybersecurity*, September 2022.

[7] Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation. 2024 Annual Report: Settling the Future. *DTCC*, March 2025.