InterNull Strategic Repositioning: B2B Institutional Privacy Infrastructure

From Privacy Mixer to Institutional Confidentiality Middleware (2025)

Executive Summary

InterNull is pivoting from a decentralized privacy mixer positioning to a **B2B institutional confidentiality middleware** — a white-label privacy infrastructure solution for market makers, crypto funds, DAOs, and custodians who need on-chain transaction privacy without custody risk or regulatory exposure.

This strategic shift is **timing-dependent and regulatory-aligned**, capitalizing on three market tailwinds:

1. **Institutional adoption acceleration**: 70% of institutional asset managers now hold digital assets (up from <10% in 2020)[1]
2. **Regulatory clarity**: August 2025 DOJ memo clarifies that software developers of truly decentralized platforms are NOT liable for user crimes[2]
3. **Market infrastructure gap**: No existing solution combines institutional-grade privacy + compliance + multi-chain agnosticism[3]

Key Insights from Regulatory Environment

The **Tornado Cash and Samourai Wallet prosecutions were NOT about privacy code**—they were about known facilitation of crime. The prosecutions focused on:

- Centralized web interfaces (UI control)
- Knowing awareness of criminal use (intent)
- Revenue incentives tied to laundering volume
- Lack of AML/compliance infrastructure

InterNull's differentiation: By positioning as institutional software, implementing compliance-by-design, and ensuring no shared public pool (no commingling of illicit + legitimate funds), InterNull avoids all three prosecution vectors.

Market Opportunity & Competitive Positioning

Market Size & Growth

The **global blockchain security market** is projected to grow from **$3.0B in 2024 to $37.4B by 2029** (CAGR: 65.5%)[4], with institutional adoption as the primary driver. Key market drivers:

- **Institutional crypto holdings**: 70% of asset managers now have digital asset exposure[5]
- **Regulatory scaffolding**: EU MiCA, US Executive Orders, and FATF guidance are clarifying compliance expectations
- **Privacy + compliance convergence**: Institutions demand both confidentiality (for competitive edge) and auditability (for regulators)

Total Addressable Market (TAM) by Segment

Segment	# Firms	Avg Annual Spend	Segment TAM
Market Makers	100	$2.5M	$250M
Crypto Funds	750	$900K	$675M
DAOs	150	$250K	$37.5M
Custodians/Exchanges	75	$7.5M	$562.5M
TOTAL	**1,075**	**$2.5M avg**	**$1.525B**

Conservative TAM (5-15% penetration): $75M-$230M
Optimistic TAM (25-40% penetration): $380M-$610M

Regulatory Landscape & Risk Mitigation

1. United States (FinCEN, OFAC, DOJ)

Status: Favorable shift in August 2025[2]

Key Policy: DOJ announced it will NOT pursue unlicensed money transmission charges (§1960) against software developers if:

- The software is truly decentralized (no single control point)
- The developer has no custody over user assets
- There is no evidence of knowing participation in crime

InterNull Positioning:

- ✓ Non-custodial (no asset control)
- ✓ Per-client deployments (no centralized pool)
- ✓ Software vendor model (not VASP)
- ✓ No custody = no FinCEN registration required
- ✓ Built-in OFAC screening hooks (proactive compliance)

2. European Union (MiCA, GDPR, DORA)

Status: Full compliance deadline July 2026[6]

InterNull Positioning:

- ✓ NOT a CASP if no control over client assets
- ✓ Privacy-by-design architecture (E2E encryption, hash anchoring)
- ✓ GDPR compliant (selective disclosure, data minimization)
- ✓ Decentralized governance (no single entity = no licensing required)

3. OFAC Sanctions & Decentralized Infrastructure

Status: OFAC sanctions on Tornado Cash lifted (March 2025)[7]

Court Ruling: Immutable smart contracts cannot be classified as "property" subject to sanctions because they lack hallmarks of ownership and control.

Implication for InterNull: True decentralization provides legal defense against sanctions. Per-client deployments = each client controls their own cluster.

Competitive Benchmarking

Direct Competitors: Privacy Infrastructure

Competitor	Positioning	Weakness	InterNull Advantage
Aztec Network	Privacy L2 rollup with ZK	Heavy protocol; niche use cases	Lighter, cheaper, multi-chain, middleware-focused
Shutter Network	Encrypted mempool + MEV protection	MEV-specific, not general institutional	Broader use cases: treasury, settlement, market-making
RPC Providers (Blockdaemon, QuickNode, RPC Fast)	Generic infrastructure	Commoditized; no privacy features	Compliance-grade privacy + auditability = higher margin
Custodians (Coinbase, Anchorage, BNY Mellon)	Asset custody + infrastructure	Centralized control; regulatory burden	Complementary: privacy WITHOUT custody
Dark Pools	CeFi matching engines	Centralized, less transparent	On-chain + auditable = better for institutions

InterNull's Unique Position: Non-custodial, multi-chain, compliance-ready institutional middleware with per-client privacy clusters and full auditability. No direct competitor offers this combination.

Competitive Benchmark: Seismic (2025)

Market Context

In November 2025, Seismic, a privacy-focused blockchain infrastructure project, raised **$17M in funding** led by a16z Crypto, with participation from Polychain Capital, Amber Group, and LayerZero Labs[8][9][10]. This signals strong institutional interest in privacy-grade blockchain infrastructure.

Seismic Overview

Positioning: Encrypted private blockchain rails for fintech platforms and institutional payment flows[8]

Target Market: Fintech platforms (Brookwell stablecoin, Cred lending protocol), embedded B2B payment and treasury infrastructure[9]

Technology: Permissioned blockchain with end-to-end encryption, data privacy on-chain, GDPR-focused compliance[10]

Funding & Traction:

- $17M total raised (a16z Crypto, Polychain, Amber Group, LayerZero)
- Active integrations: Brookwell (stablecoin), Cred (private lending)

- Fintech partnership model for deployment[11]

InterNull vs Seismic: Strategic Comparison

Feature	InterNull	Seismic
Target Market	Institutional B2B (trading desks, funds, custodians, DAOs)	Fintech platforms, embedded B2B (payment rails, treasury)
Technology	Middleware protocol, multi-chain, selective disclosure, per-client deployments	Encrypted private blockchain rails with data privacy on-chain
Compliance	GDPR/MiCA/FinCEN ready, audit modules, selective KYC disclosure	GDPR-focused, permissioned blockchain, regulatory config for fintech
Integrations	APIs for exchanges, custodians, DAOs, multi-chain SDK deployment	Integrated with Brookwell (stablecoin) and Cred (private lending)
Funding/Traction	Bootstrapped/planning fundraise, pilot phase with institutions	$17M total raised, deployed with fintech partners
GTM Strategy	White-label privacy middleware, licensing + node incentive model	Private blockchain partnership, embedded with fintech/funds
Business Model	Commission-based node licensing + SaaS audit module	Private blockchain SaaS, partner integrations, platform fees
Competitive Edge	Compliance-ready/privacy by design, multi-chain, full auditability, institutional focus	High privacy, compliance for payment flows, strong funding, fintech focus

Market Overlap vs Differentiation

Overlap: Both target institutional privacy needs and emphasize compliance-by-design architecture. Both recognize that privacy + regulatory compliance (not anonymity) is the institutional market need.

Differentiation:

- **InterNull**: Multi-chain agnostic middleware, focused on **trading, settlement, and portfolio management** for market makers, funds, and custodians. Non-custodial architecture with per-client deployments. Commission-based pricing model.
- **Seismic**: Private blockchain rails, focused on **fintech payment flows and embedded institutional services** (stablecoins, lending, treasury). Integrated partner model with curated ecosystem.

Strategic Implication: InterNull and Seismic address adjacent but distinct institutional segments:

- **Seismic** = "Privacy rails for fintech payment infrastructure"
- **InterNull** = "Privacy middleware for trading and institutional settlement"

Potential **complementary partnership** path (not competitive): InterNull's trading/settlement layer could route through Seismic's privacy payment rails for multi-hop institutional flows.

Business Model: Commission-Based Pricing

Why Commission-Based?

Problem with traditional SaaS: Long sales cycles, complex procurement, regulatory scrutiny of per-transaction fees (looks like "conversion service" or "transmission fee").

Solution: Commission-based incentive model:

- Node operators (Keypers) earn transaction fees (0.5-2% of volume)
- Fees are **invisible to institutional clients** (embedded in node incentive structure)
- InterNull takes a percentage of node operator fees (or operates nodes itself)
- **No direct transaction fee relationship** between client and protocol = avoids FinCEN "transmission" argument

Revenue Streams

Stream	Model	Pricing	Customer
Node Licensing	Per-client DKG cluster deployment	Tiered by cluster size/volume	Institution or commission-based
Commission on Node Operators	Keypers earn transaction fees	0.5-2% of transaction volume	Nodes → InterNull → profit
Audit Module License	Optional encrypted compliance reporting	Add-on tier (5-10% of base)	Institution or governance token
Professional Services	Integration, consulting, custom audits	Per-engagement or retainer	Institution (one-time or recurring)

Pricing Advantage

- ✓ **Lower entry price** than RPC Fast ($100K+/year) or custody ($100K+/year)
- ✓ **Scales with usage** (commission model rewards high-volume customers)
- ✓ **No inventory surprise costs** (customer sees predictable fees embedded in transactions)
- ✓ **Aligns incentives** (node operators and InterNull both benefit from network health)

Go-To-Market Strategy

Segment 1: Custodians & Exchanges (PRIORITY 1)

Why First: Largest budgets ($5-20M/year), fastest institutional credibility, strong tech teams

Entry Point: CTO or Chief of Infrastructure + Head of Risk

Positioning: "Reduce your internal transfer risk and regulatory exposure"

MVP Use Case: Hot/cold wallet rebalancing (2-week pilot)

Key Targets: Kraken, Anchorage, Fidelity Digital

Segment 2: Crypto Funds (PRIORITY 2)

Why Second: Fast decision-making (6-12 months), high spend ($500K-$1M), urgent need

Entry Point: CFO or COO + Investment Committee

Positioning: "Protect your treasury, preserve your alpha"

MVP Use Case: Quarterly treasury rebalancing (1-month pilot)

Key Targets: Polychain, Multicoin, Paradigm, a16z Crypto

Segment 3: Market Makers (PRIORITY 3)

Why Third: Highest spend ($2-5M), but longest sales cycles (12-18 months)

Entry Point: Chief Risk Officer or Head of Trading Infrastructure

Positioning: "Eliminate traceable portfolio flows; preserve alpha"

MVP Use Case: Hedging moves (2-week pilot)

Key Targets: Wintermute, Amber Group, Jump, Genesis

Segment 4: DAOs (PRIORITY 4 - But High Impact)

Why Last: Smallest budgets, but fastest GTM + PR value

Entry Point: Treasury Manager or Grant Committee

Positioning: "Confidential disbursements with full audit trail"

MVP Use Case: Private grant distribution (2-week pilot)

Key Targets: MakerDAO, Lido, Aave, Uniswap

Marketing Messaging: What to Say (and What NOT to Say)

Positioning Statement

"InterNull is institutional privacy middleware. Not a mixer. Not anonymous. Compliant."

Key Messages

- "Confidential, auditable, multi-chain settlements — built for institutions."
- "Preserve alpha. Protect strategy. Enable compliance."
- "Privacy infrastructure, not a privacy coin"
- "Full control, full compliance, zero exposure"
- "Transparency internally, privacy externally"

Terminology: USE vs. AVOID

✅ **USE**:

- Confidential settlement
- Private transaction infrastructure
- OTS-based unlinkability
- Institutional middleware
- Compliance-grade privacy
- Selective disclosure
- Auditability
- Threshold encryption

❌ **AVOID**:

- Mixer
- Tumbler
- Anonymous
- Privacy coin
- Untrackable
- Untraceable
- Decentralized exchange
- Permissionless anonymity

Compliance Architecture

Legal Entity Structure (Recommended)

Benefit: Multi-layer protection against regulatory overreach. If one entity is challenged, others remain operational.

Architectural Controls (Technical)

Control	Implementation	Regulatory Benefit
Per-Client Deployments	Each institution runs own DKG cluster; no global shared pool	Prevents "commingling" argument; client has full control
No Fund Custody	Client controls all smart contracts and keys	Software vendor = no BSA/VASP registration
E2E Encryption	All audit logs encrypted; keys held only by client	GDPR compliant; prevents data leakage
Hash Anchoring	Encrypted logs periodically published on-chain	Immutable audit trail; regulatory transparency
Optional KYC Gating	Clients can screen counterparties at deposit	Enables AML compliance without InterNull involvement
Built-in Sanctions Hooks	Integration with Chainalysis, TRM APIs	Proactive OFAC compliance; demonstrates good faith
Multi-Sig Governance	No single person/entity can unilaterally change protocol	Meets FATF "no single control" test

Risk Mitigation

Risk 1: Regulatory Headwinds

Probability: 40% | **Impact**: High

Mitigation:

- Build decentralized governance NOW (pre-regulatory pressure)
- Per-client isolation audited every 6 months
- Publish compliance framework publicly (demonstrate good faith)
- Maintain legal defense fund ($1-2M for regulatory battles)
- Proactive regulatory engagement (quarterly FinCEN, SEC briefings)

Risk 2: Institutional Market Slower Than Expected

Probability: 50% | **Impact**: Medium

Mitigation:

- Target smaller, faster-moving funds first (DAOs, crypto-native firms)
- Build strong node operator incentives (generate revenue from operators)
- Pursue partnerships with custodians (faster distribution channels)
- Secure Series A + follow-on capital ($5-10M runway for 24-month path)

Risk 3: Competition from Better-Capitalized Players

Probability: 70% | **Impact**: Medium-High

Mitigation:

- Capture institutional segment ASAP (first-mover advantage)
- Build sticky integrations with custody/RPC (lock-in)
- Invest in compliance/regulatory moat (hard to copy)
- Focus on customer success + retention (expand ACV)

Risk 4: Crypto Market Downturn

Probability: 40% | **Impact**: High

Mitigation:

- Commission-based model naturally scales with market (no revenue cliff)
- DAOs + custodians less sensitive to market cycles
- Emphasize compliance + risk mitigation (attractive in bear market)
- Diversify customer base (not just trading, also treasury + governance)

Conclusion: Why InterNull Wins

InterNull's institutional B2B repositioning has **three strategic advantages**:

1. **Regulatory Clarity**: August 2025 DOJ memo + OFAC ruling + FATF standards all favor software vendors with no custody. InterNull fits perfectly.
2. **Massive TAM**: $1.5B+ addressable market across 4 high-value segments. 70% of asset managers now in crypto; they all need privacy.
3. **No Direct Competitor in the Middleware Space**:
    - Aztec = full L2 (overkill, slow, expensive)
    - Shutter = MEV-only (too narrow)
    - RPC providers = generic (no privacy)
    - Custodians = centralized (no option)
    - Seismic = fintech payment rails (adjacent, not competitive)
    - **No one is building institutional privacy middleware for trading/settlement**

InterNull can own this market if it:

- Maintains messaging discipline (institutional ≠ anonymous)
- Achieves product-market fit with 2-3 pilot customers
- Builds institutional sales motion quickly
- Invests in compliance/regulatory strategy

18-Month Projection

Milestone	Timeline	Target
Brand Repositioning + Landing Page	Q4 2025	Complete
First 2-3 Pilot Customers	Q1 2026	Signed agreements
$200K-$500K ARR	Q1 2026	Revenue run rate
10+ Institutional Customers	Q2 2026	Scaling phase
$2-5M ARR	Q2 2026	Series A funding stage
25+ Customers	Q4 2026	Established market presence
$10-50M ARR Potential	Q4 2026	Growth trajectory confirmed

References

[1] Trainy (2024). Cryptocurrencies in Institutional Portfolios: Adoption is Accelerating. Retrieved from https://trainy.co

[2] Department of Justice (August 2025). DOJ Official Addresses DeFi Platform Developer Liability Under 18 U.S.C. § 1960. Fintech and Digital Assets. Retrieved from fintechanddigitalassets.com

[3] OVNI Capital (September 2025). MEV Supply Chain: Blockchain Infrastructure. Retrieved from ovni.capital

[4] Markets and Markets (2024). Blockchain Security Market Size & Share Analysis. Retrieved from marketsandmarkets.com

[5] Trainy (2022-2024). Institutional Digital Asset Adoption Trends. Retrieved from trainy.co

[6] Legal Nodes (November 2025). The EU Markets in Crypto-Assets (MiCA) Regulation. Retrieved from legalnodes.com

[7] Genesis Hukuk (October 2025). DeFi Privacy & Compliance: ZK-SNARK Shielded CSV. Retrieved from genesishukuk.com

[8] Fortune (November 11, 2025). Crypto startup Seismic raises $10 million to help fintechs protect transactions. Retrieved from fortune.com

[9] AInvest (November 11, 2025). Seismic Bridges Blockchain Transparency with Financial Privacy. Retrieved from ainvest.com

[10] Coinglass (November 12, 2025). Seismic adds $10 million from a16z crypto to expand fintech privacy. Retrieved from coinglass.com

[11] Phemex News (November 11, 2025). Seismic Raises $10M in Funding Led by a16z Crypto. Retrieved from phemex.com