ChatGPT

Institutional Adoption of Decentralized Finance (DeFi) Systems

Major financial institutions – including banks, hedge funds, asset managers, and even governments – are actively exploring decentralized finance (DeFi) to access new markets and yield opportunities. This report examines the key types of DeFi systems poised for institutional use, such as decentralized lending, exchanges, custody solutions, on-chain asset management, yield platforms, and tokenized real-world assets. We highlight how institutional requirements (security, compliance, regulatory clarity) shape their engagement with DeFi, and how adoption trends vary by institution type and region. While the technical infrastructure has matured, actual institutional capital deployment remains cautious due to legal and fiduciary considerations [1] [2]. The sections below detail each use case, with examples of protocols and platforms being trialed or adopted by institutions.

Decentralized Lending and Borrowing Platforms

One of the most immediate institutional use cases in DeFi is **lending and borrowing**. Decentralized money market protocols like **Aave** and **Compound** allow users to lend assets (earning interest) or borrow against collateral via smart contracts. Institutional investors are attracted by the higher yields these platforms offer compared to traditional markets [3]. For example, depositing stablecoins on Compound or Aave can earn interest well above bank deposit rates, and institutions with large balances seek to capitalize on this yield differential. Hedge funds and trading firms also use DeFi lending markets to borrow crypto assets for short-term liquidity or leveraged trading strategies.

Institutional Lending Initiatives: To accommodate compliance needs, new versions of these protocols have emerged:

- **Aave Arc (Permissioned Pools):** Aave launched *Arc*, a KYC-gated version of its lending pool exclusively for verified institutional participants [4]. Only whitelisted firms (vetted by regulated entities like Fireblocks) can participate, ensuring all counterparties meet compliance standards [5]. In early trials, Aave Arc onboarded 30 institutional players via Fireblocks' whitelisting service [6], demonstrating demand for a walled-garden DeFi experience. However, uptake has been modest – by 2025 Aave Arc held only ~$50k in total value, underscoring that permissioning alone hasn't solved institutions' legal concerns [7].

- **Under-Collateralized Credit Protocols:** Beyond over-collateralized lending, some DeFi platforms target institutional borrowers with under-collateralized or real-world loans. **Maple Finance**, **Goldfinch**, and **Centrifuge** facilitate loans to businesses and fintech lenders by tokenizing debt obligations. These protocols offer features like senior/junior loan tranches and improved reporting to appeal to institutional credit investors [8]. Yields in these private credit pools range around 9–12%, higher than comparable public markets [8]. For example, Goldfinch provides undercollateralized loans in emerging markets and tokens representing the credit exposure are sold to investors [9]. Such projects have grown quickly – by 2025 the tokenized private credit market

reached ~$17.5B, though most funding still comes from crypto-native funds rather than traditional banks [10]. Institutions cite inconsistent due diligence and illiquid secondary markets as barriers [11].

- **MakerDAO and On-Chain Collateralized Loans:** *MakerDAO* demonstrates how DeFi lending can integrate real-world assets (discussed further below). Maker allows entities (even traditional firms) to borrow its DAI stablecoin by posting collateral, which now includes real-world assets like bonds and loans. By late 2023 nearly **46% of DAI in circulation was backed by real-world asset collateral**, and roughly 48% of Maker's revenue came from these RWA-backed loans [12]. Notably, a French bank's digital arm (Societe Generale Forge) and a U.S. community bank each tested borrowing DAI against bond-backed tokens, illustrating institutional borrowers tapping DeFi liquidity under structured legal agreements. Maker's model offers a template for how on-chain lending can be fused with off-chain assets, though it required extensive legal structuring to ensure enforceability of the collateral.

Institutional Considerations: In using DeFi lending platforms, institutions prioritize **counterparty transparency and risk controls**. They often **limit exposure to whitelisted pools** (as with Aave Arc) or work through intermediaries that perform KYC on borrowers. Custodial wallets with multi-signature approval flows are employed so that no single trader can move large sums unilaterally [13]. Despite the allure of yields, many regulated institutions remain hesitant – as one report noted, *"permissioned lending pools are available"* and real-world collateral is supported, *"but none of this has led to meaningful capital flows"* from traditional institutional investors due to unresolved legal risk [1] [14]. Thus, current participants in DeFi lending skew toward crypto-focused funds, family offices, and boutique asset managers with higher risk tolerance, rather than big banks or pension funds [14].

Decentralized Exchanges and Liquidity Protocols

Decentralized exchanges (DEXs) – such as **Uniswap**, **Curve**, and others – enable peer-to-peer trading of assets without intermediaries. They use automated market maker (AMM) algorithms or order-book hybrids to facilitate swaps with on-chain liquidity pools. Institutions see DEXs as a way to access liquidity for digital assets and potentially improve trade settlement times. For example, decentralized exchanges allow 24/7 trading and near-instant settlement, which could reduce counterparty risk in comparison to waiting days for traditional trade clearing.

Institutional Usage of DEXs: Thus far, institutional engagement with DEXs has been experimental but promising:

- **Liquidity Provision and Arbitrage:** Several crypto hedge funds and market makers (e.g. Jump Trading, Wintermute) already operate on DEXs, providing large amounts of liquidity to earn trading fees and arbitrage profits. These firms function akin to hedge funds, deploying capital into **Uniswap v3 liquidity pools** or **Curve pools** for stablecoins, where they actively manage positions to tighten spreads [15]. Such activity improves DEX liquidity and in effect brings institutional-grade market-making strategies on-chain. Some traditional trading firms have even built custom algorithms for concentrated liquidity provision on Uniswap v3, indicating a blending of Wall Street techniques with DeFi platforms.

- **Institutional DeFi Pilots (Project Guardian):** A landmark example of banks using DEX technology is **Project Guardian** in Singapore. In 2022, DBS Bank (Singapore), J.P. Morgan, and SBI Digital Asset

conducted pilot trades of tokenized government bonds and forex using **Aave** and **Uniswap** on a public blockchain (Polygon) under the Monetary Authority of Singapore's oversight [16] [17]. In this trial, tokenized SGD deposits and Japanese government bonds were pooled, and trades were executed via an automated market maker – effectively a regulated liquidity pool for FX and bond trading [17]. To meet institutional requirements, the pilot introduced *"trust anchors"* (regulated institutions that issued verifiable credentials to participants) so that counterparties were known while still transacting on a DeFi platform [18]. This experiment demonstrated the potential of DEX mechanisms (like AMMs) to enable **atomic settlement** of large trades with reduced intermediaries, while highlighting gaps to address (e.g. needing price oracles from Bloomberg/Refinitiv for fair pricing of bonds in the pool [19]). The success of Project Guardian's first phase – called *"the most advanced exploration into DeFi by big banks and regulators"* [20] – has led to further trials in Singapore, and is often cited as a blueprint for institutional DeFi adoption without compromising regulatory comfort.

- **Emerging Institutional DEX Models:** Some ventures are rethinking DEX design to suit institutional traders. For instance, **Nomura's** crypto subsidiary Laser Digital invested in *Orderly Network*, a DeFi trading infrastructure on NEAR that uses a traditional order-book and dedicated market makers instead of pure AMMs [21]. Order-book DEX designs aim to offer tighter bid-ask spreads and more familiar execution, since AMM algorithms can be suboptimal for large orders (often requiring costly arbitrage to maintain prices) [21]. This suggests that future institutional DEXs may hybridize DeFi's 24/7 settlement and transparency with the *market structure of centralized exchanges*, to better serve banks and sophisticated traders. Additionally, we see the rise of request-for-quote (RFQ) systems and dark pool-like DEXs that let institutions trade large blocks with minimal slippage, all while settling on-chain for transparency.

Institutional Considerations: When engaging with DEXs, institutions must navigate **price volatility, slippage, and front-running risks** (e.g. MEV – Miner Extractable Value). They mitigate these by using **aggregators and execution algorithms** that split orders, by providing liquidity in stable asset pools, or by transacting during off-peak hours to minimize impact. Compliance is a critical factor – firms often use DEX gateways that include AML checks. The *open nature of DEX liquidity* poses a challenge: regulated entities cannot easily justify trading against unknown counterparties on a public DEX. Solutions like **permissioned liquidity pools** or using **verified counterparties as liquidity providers** are being explored to allow DEX trading within a compliance perimeter [18]. The MAS pilot's use of verifiable credentials is one approach to **"add a layer of safeguards for compliance" without creating completely closed pools [18]. In practice, many institutions currently limit direct DEX usage to small portions of their activity, often via their crypto trading desks or VC arms, until the landscape matures.

Institutional DeFi Custody and Access Solutions

Traditional financial institutions face stringent requirements around **custody, security, and oversight** of assets – which standard DeFi wallet setups do not meet. In retail DeFi, individuals typically use self-custodied wallets (e.g. MetaMask) where a single private key controls funds. This is untenable for institutions that require multi-person approval, audit trails, and protection against key loss or theft [13] [22]. As a result, a critical piece of the institutional DeFi stack is the development of **enterprise-grade custody and access solutions** that serve as a secure gateway to DeFi protocols.

Key Solutions Enabling Institutional Access:

- **Custodial Wallet Platforms (Fireblocks, Copper, Anchorage):** These technology providers offer **multi-party computation (MPC) wallets**, hardware security modules, and **multi-user policy controls** to secure digital assets. For example, Fireblocks is a popular platform used by over 1,800 organizations that manages private keys such that no single insider can compromise them [23]. Fireblocks' console and API integrate with WalletConnect and other interfaces, allowing institutional traders to connect to **100+ DeFi dApps securely** without using browser wallets [24]. Crucially, these platforms support **role-based permissions, transaction whitelists, and automated audit logs** so that every DeFi transaction can be monitored and compliant with internal and external rules [25]. They also carry insurance policies (Fireblocks provides up to $30M insurance coverage) to give comfort against losses due to technical failures [26]. Such infrastructure mitigates the operational risks of DeFi – one Fireblocks paper noted that accessing DEXs via normal browsers could expose keys to hackers, and that institutions using retail wallets might struggle to get insurance [13]. By solving key custody and **incorporating multi-signature approval**, these custodians make it possible for a fund to, say, execute a trade on Uniswap with the same oversight as a trade on a traditional exchange.

- **MetaMask Institutional (MMI):** This is a specialized version of the popular MetaMask wallet designed for organizations. MMI integrates with custodial backends like Fireblocks, BitGo, and others, marrying the familiar DeFi interface with enterprise security. In 2023, ConsenSys (MetaMask's developer) partnered with Fireblocks so that any Fireblocks client can directly connect their custody account to MetaMask Institutional [27] [23]. This **gave institutional users access to over 17,000 DeFi and Web3 dApps (Aave, Lido, GMX, etc.)** through the MMI interface while Fireblocks handles key management behind the scenes [23]. The integration reflects a broader push to "bridge every organization into web3" by combining institutional custody tech with the rich DeFi ecosystem [28]. Similarly, other custody tech providers (Copper's ClearLoop, Coinbase Custody, etc.) have built connections to DeFi protocols, enabling trades or lending directly from cold storage wallets, but with an approval process wrapping each transaction.

- **Exchange and Prime Brokerage Platforms:** Large crypto exchanges and brokerages are also acting as intermediaries for institutional DeFi access. **Coinbase Prime, Kraken Institutional, and Anchorage Digital** offer services where clients can earn yield or stake assets in DeFi without interacting with the protocols manually [29]. For example, Coinbase Institutional has rolled out **DeFi staking and lending products** – a client's assets may be deployed into protocols like Compound, Aave, or Lido, but Coinbase handles the smart contract interactions, custody, and compliance reporting [29]. This *"CeDeFi"* model (centralized entity providing DeFi yields) gives institutions a single accountable counterparty (the exchange) while still getting the benefits of decentralized platforms under the hood. It addresses concerns like tax documentation, **on-demand liquidity (via the prime broker if needed), and simplified onboarding**.

Compliance and Gatekeeping: These institutional access solutions invariably incorporate **KYC/AML checks and whitelisting**. For instance, to join Aave Arc's institutional pool, an institution must be onboarded by a whitelister (Fireblocks) who verifies its identity and compliance status [5]. Similarly, custodial platforms maintain strict compliance programs and often geo-fence certain DeFi apps that are too risky or haven't passed internal due diligence. Institutions can configure rules such as *"only allow interactions with approved protocols and stablecoins"* on their custody platform [25]. This kind of controlled access is

essential for regulated players – it ensures, for example, that a bank's trader cannot accidentally connect to a spoofed DeFi site or engage in a prohibited transaction. These solutions also produce the **audit trails** needed for regulators and internal risk managers: every on-chain interaction is recorded and can be mapped to an authorized employee and purpose.

By solving for key custody, security, and compliance visibility, institutional gateway solutions have accelerated the ability of traditional firms to test DeFi waters. They effectively act as the **secure "web browsers" and brokers for DeFi** in an institutional context, much as web browsers and banks provide secure access to the internet for retail users.

On-Chain Asset Management and Structured Products

Beyond trading and lending, institutions are interested in how **asset management and structured financial products** can be executed on-chain. *On-chain asset management* refers to managing portfolios of assets via smart contracts – for example, an investment fund whose holdings and trades are transparently executed on Ethereum. DeFi offers the tools to create index funds, structured yield products, and even automated strategy vaults that might parallel traditional hedge fund strategies, all within a decentralized framework.

On-Chain Funds and Portfolio Management: A number of DeFi platforms allow the creation of on-chain investment vehicles:

- **Asset Management Protocols (Enzyme, Set Protocol):** Platforms like **Enzyme Finance (formerly Melon)** provide infrastructure for launching and managing a fund on-chain. An asset manager can set up a vault with specified strategies, accepted assets, and risk parameters, and external investors can then contribute capital to this vault. Smart contracts enforce the fund's mandate (e.g., only invest in whitelisted DeFi pools, or maintain certain asset allocations) and record every trade. This gives investors real-time transparency into the fund's holdings and performance – an attractive feature for due diligence [30] [31]. Enzyme reports that both crypto-native fund managers and some traditional advisors are using its system to run strategies ranging from yield farming to market-neutral algorithms. In fact, by 2025, businesses and managers had over $170M deployed via Enzyme vaults, indicating early institutional usage [32]. The **benefits** cited include automated trade execution, elimination of manual reconciliation (since the blockchain is the source of truth), and easier investor onboarding globally (via tokenized shares of the fund that can potentially be traded on secondary markets). However, **challenges** remain around legal structuring – often these on-chain funds still need an off-chain legal wrapper (like a Cayman fund entity) to satisfy securities laws for outside investors.

- **Structured Product Protocols (Derivatives and Yield Vaults):** DeFi has given rise to structured products that mirror the payoff profiles of traditional derivatives or fixed-income structures. For instance, **Ribbon Finance** offers automated *option strategies* (like covered calls and put-selling) packaged into vaults that users can deposit into [33]. This creates a yield product whose returns come from options premiums – conceptually similar to structured notes that banks design. Other protocols like **BarnBridge** and **Pendle** allow the splitting of yield streams into tranches (fixed vs variable rates), effectively creating **interest rate derivatives** on DeFi yields. Institutions, especially hedge funds, monitor these as they could use them to hedge DeFi interest rate volatility or earn enhanced yield with managed risk. We are also seeing indices and actively managed token portfolios

(e.g. decentralized index funds such as Index Coop's DeFi Pulse Index, or tokenized baskets on Set Protocol) that asset managers might use for quick exposure to the crypto sector. While these on-chain structured products are mostly used by crypto-savvy investors today, traditional firms are **studying them or backing their development**. For example, crypto VC wings of traditional firms have funded options protocols, and banks like JPMorgan have noted the innovative risk transfer mechanisms in DeFi that could eventually be applied to traditional assets.

- **Insurance and Risk Pools:** Another class of DeFi product relevant to institutions is decentralized insurance (e.g. **Nexus Mutual**, **Etherisc**). These allow pooling capital to insure against crypto risks like smart contract hacks. Some institutions (or more often, crypto companies) participate by contributing to such pools to earn premiums, effectively acting as underwriters. There are also **parametric insurance** products being developed on-chain for real-world events (like crop insurance paying out based on weather oracles). While still nascent, this could interest reinsurance firms and others in the long run, as a way to tap new risk markets.

Institutional Advantages: On-chain asset management offers **unprecedented transparency and automation**. A blockchain-based fund provides investors instant insight into asset allocations and removes layers of intermediaries (custodians, fund administrators) since the smart contract handles custody and accounting by design [30] [34]. This can reduce fees and operational risk. It also allows creative structures – e.g., a fund that automatically rebalances or executes an algorithmic strategy with zero intervention, potentially even **autonomous "code-based" hedge funds**. There are reports of hedge funds experimenting with *DAO-like funds* or AI-run on-chain funds by 2025, aiming to leverage these benefits in a regulated manner [35].

Barriers: However, institutions must consider **regulatory treatment** – an on-chain fund might inadvertently create an unregistered security offering if not properly sandboxed. To engage, asset managers often run small pilot programs or parallel "shadow" portfolios on-chain. Additionally, **liquidity and track record** are concerns: many DeFi structured products are new and thinly traded, so big institutions worry about scalability and exit strategy. Nonetheless, the trend is that forward-thinking asset managers (like Franklin Templeton with its tokenized money market fund, or hedge funds like Brevan Howard through its crypto division) view on-chain finance as *"the future of portfolio management"*, offering real-time auditability and access to new asset classes [30].

Yield Optimization and Staking Platforms

Generating yield on idle assets is a core objective for many institutional investors, and DeFi has opened up new avenues for yield generation that are drawing interest. Two prominent categories here are **yield optimizers** (which maximize returns across DeFi opportunities) and **staking services** (earning rewards for securing proof-of-stake networks).

Yield Optimization (Yield Farming Aggregators): In the retail DeFi boom, users engaged in *"yield farming"* – moving funds across protocols to capture incentive rewards and high interest rates. For institutions, manually doing this is impractical, but specialized platforms automate the process:

- **Yearn Finance and Aggregators:** Yearn was one of the first yield optimizers, offering "vaults" where users deposit an asset and Yearn's strategies automatically allocate it to the most profitable DeFi pools or farms. For instance, a USDC vault might rotate funds between Compound, Aave, and a

Curve pool based on which yields more, including any governance token rewards. Such services can drastically improve returns but require trust in the strategy and smart contract security. A hedge fund or family office might use a vetted aggregator to enhance yield on its crypto holdings. Indeed, some smaller crypto funds have reportedly utilized Yearn vaults for their clients' assets, as it saves them the engineering effort of building their own yield-farming bots. **Institutional adoption of these tools remains cautious**, though, due to the opaque risk (smart contract exploits, strategy risk). To bridge that gap, there are now "managed DeFi" offerings – for example, some crypto asset managers offer *yield funds* that effectively put client money into these strategies, with the manager doing risk assessments and providing a single point of contact.

- **CeDeFi Yield Products:** As noted earlier, centralized firms are repackaging DeFi yields in a more familiar format. **Compound Treasury** is a prime example – it offers a fixed 4% annual yield on USDC deposits to institutions by pooling those deposits and lending them out on the Compound protocol in the background [36]. Compound Treasury even obtained an *S&P credit rating of B-* (a speculative grade) on this offering – the first time a DeFi-based product was rated by a major agency [37] [38]. While the rating was low, Compound noted it as *"tremendous progress"* that DeFi yields could be evaluated by traditional standards, helping institutions *"dip their toes into DeFi"* via a familiar risk framework [38]. By 2023, Compound Treasury had a small but notable $180 million in deposits from around 20 customers [39], showing early institutional willingness to participate when the interface is simplified. Similarly, other fintech platforms (like CoinChange or Galaxy Digital's funds) offer structured DeFi yield products where the client might only see a fixed APY, while behind the scenes the provider allocates funds to various lending pools, liquidity mining, or arbitrage strategies. These act as a *"translation layer"* for institutional investors [40].

Staking and Yield from Staked Assets: With the shift of major blockchains (notably Ethereum) to proof-of-stake, institutions holding these assets are keen not to miss out on **staking rewards** (which can be 4–10% annually for major networks). However, staking directly requires running validator nodes and locking up assets, which many institutions outsource due to technical and custodial complexity:

- **Institutional Staking Services:** Companies like **Figment, Coinbase Custody, Blockdaemon, and Kraken** provide staking-as-a-service where they run the infrastructure and ensure the process meets compliance needs (for example, providing 1099 tax forms for staking rewards in the U.S.). This allows institutions to earn native staking yields on assets like ETH, DOT, SOL, etc., without managing keys or infrastructure. Per a 2024 report, *Coinbase Institutional saw significant uptick in clients using its ETH staking, often via a DeFi integration like Lido* [29].

- **Liquid Staking and Yield Tokens:** DeFi has popularized **liquid staking tokens (LSTs)** – when you stake your asset, you receive a derivative token (like **Lido's stETH** for staked ETH) that continues to earn staking yield but can also be used in DeFi. Institutions are exploring this because it solves the liquidity lock-up issue; they can stake large holdings and still maintain some liquidity by using the LST in lending or trading. **Lido** became a dominant player, and by 2025 even institutional custodians are integrating with Lido or similar protocols. For example, Fireblocks teamed up with the **Liquid Collective (Alluvial)** to bring an enterprise-grade liquid staking token (LsETH) to its 2,000+ institutional clients [41]. Liquid Collective's protocol was designed with input from firms like Coinbase and Kraken to ensure *KYC/AML can be connected* and that the staking operations are SOC2-compliant [42]. This kind of *"institutional liquid staking"* lets funds earn Ethereum staking rewards while having a token they could sell or use as collateral if needed, all through a compliance-friendly framework.

- **Yield Optimization on Staked Assets:** Some yield platforms also layer additional strategies on staked assets. For instance, an institution might stake ETH to earn base rewards, then deposit the staked-ETH token into a DeFi lending protocol to earn extra yield, effectively "stacking" yields. These compounded strategies are high-risk (and were mainly the realm of crypto hedge funds), but we mention them to illustrate the innovation – by 2025 structured products exist that bundle staking yield with options selling to produce enhanced income, which sophisticated institutions (or the crypto desks of traditional firms) are examining.

Risk and Regulatory View: When it comes to chasing yield in DeFi, **risk management is paramount** for institutions. The collapse of some yield strategies (e.g., the Terra/Luna incident in 2022) made clear that blindly chasing high APYs can be disastrous. Therefore, institutions perform due diligence on smart contract risk, often capping how much they allocate to any single protocol. Many have an internal whitelist of protocols deemed "institutional grade," focusing on those audited, with large TVL, and preferably some insurance or recourse. Regulatory guidance is evolving: some jurisdictions like Hong Kong have issued guidelines on allowable yield activities for licensed firms, and the U.S. SEC has scrutinized yield products (treating some as securities offerings). This pushes institutional players toward **conservative strategies** – for example, *earning yield on USD stablecoins via blue-chip protocols* (which might be considered similar to a money market activity) or *staking major layer-1 coins*, rather than speculative farming of obscure tokens. Still, the **attraction of DeFi yields in a low interest rate environment** (as was until 2022) was a key catalyst for institutional interest [43]. Even as rates rose globally, the unique opportunities (like earning 5-10% on stablecoin lending, or double-digit yields on fintech loan pools) keep institutions engaged, provided they can justify the risks.

Tokenized Securities and Real-World Assets (RWA)

Perhaps the most significant bridge between traditional finance and DeFi is the advent of **tokenized real-world assets** – bringing instruments like securities, bonds, loans, real estate, and commodities onto blockchain rails. Institutions are particularly interested in this area because it involves *familiar assets in a new wrapper*, promising improvements in settlement speed, fractional ownership, and 24/7 markets. Tokenized real-world assets often manifest as **stablecoins (tokenized cash)**, **security tokens (equity or debt on-chain)**, or **reference tokens (e.g. tokens mirroring the value of Treasury bills or real estate)**. Combined with DeFi protocols, these assets can be traded or used as collateral seamlessly on-chain.

Growth and Traction: The tokenization of real-world assets has accelerated notably. According to a 2024 analysis, the total value of tokenized real-world assets was projected to **surpass $500 billion by the end of 2025**, a massive jump from under $3B in 2020 [44]. This growth is fueled by large financial institutions and fintechs starting to tokenize parts of their asset portfolios. For example:

- **Tokenized Money Market Funds and Bonds:** Several high-profile asset managers have launched tokenized versions of traditional funds. **Franklin Templeton** pioneered an on-chain U.S. government money market fund (Franklin OnChain U.S. Government Money Fund) which uses the Stellar and Polygon blockchains to record ownership. By April 2023 it had over $270M in AUM, demonstrating real investor money in a blockchain-recorded fund. **BlackRock** partnered in late 2022 on a tokenized money market fund pilot (nicknamed *"BUDL"*) on Polygon as well [45]. These funds remain fully regulated (under the 1940 Act in the U.S., for example) – the innovation is that shares are represented as tokens that can potentially interoperate with DeFi. However, even when big names are involved, *institutional investors (like corporate treasurers or pensions) have so far stayed on the*

sidelines of these tokenized funds [46]. A key reason cited is uncertainty about **legal enforceability**: if a token holder claims ownership, how is that treated in insolvency or disputes? [46] Until frameworks clarify that an on-chain record definitively equals legal title, risk-averse institutions are cautious.

- **On-Chain Bonds and Securities:** Governments and banks have tested issuing bonds on public blockchains. The **European Investment Bank (EIB)** issued €100M in digital bonds on Ethereum in 2021 (with Goldman Sachs and others facilitating), and repeated this in 2023 on a private chain – a sign that capital markets institutions are experimenting. In Asia, **Singapore's DBS Bank** issued a digital bond on its blockchain exchange, and **HSBC** and others have done bond tokenization trials. Furthermore, **Project Guardian** (mentioned earlier) successfully traded tokenized Singapore Government Securities and Japanese bonds within a DeFi pool [17]. This was groundbreaking as it merged regulated bond markets with DeFi technology, potentially pointing to a future where **government debt could be transacted via AMMs** for instant atomic settlement across currencies. Central banks are also exploring this: the BIS's *Project Mariana* in 2023 tested using a Curve-style AMM to exchange hypothetical CBDCs (tokenized Euros, Swiss Francs, Singapore Dollars) for cross-border interbank FX settlement [47]. The results showed technical feasibility of using AMMs for forex with **wholesale CBDC tokens** [48]. Governments like the UK have signaled interest in using blockchain for issuing and settling government debt, though large-scale adoption is likely a few years out as legal and tech details are sorted.

- **Real Estate and Alternative Assets:** Tokenization isn't limited to traditional securities. Some firms have tokenized real estate ownership (offering fractional shares in rental properties via security tokens), art, commodities, and even revenue streams (e.g., future music royalties tokenized for investment). While many of these are still in startup or pilot phase, they illustrate the breadth of assets that can be brought into DeFi. A tokenized real estate share, for example, could be used as collateral in a DeFi loan on a platform like MakerDAO or Centrifuge, potentially unlocking home equity much faster than traditional methods. **Centrifuge** specifically has pools where assets like invoices, trade finance receivables, or real estate bridge loans are financed by DeFi investors – providing liquidity to real-world borrowers. These models have drawn interest from private credit funds; indeed, Centrifuge's institutional partnerships (e.g., with MakerDAO and an array of fintech lenders) have grown such that tokenized private credit is one of the fastest-growing tokenization segments [49].

Institutional Outlook: Institutions see tokenization as a way to *modernize market infrastructure*. Benefits often cited include: 24/7 trading (no waiting for NYSE to open), **faster settlement (T+0 or T+1 instead of T+2 weeks)**, **fractional ownership** (attracting more investors or allowing bespoke portfolios), and **programmability** (e.g., automating coupon payments via smart contract). For asset managers, tokenization can broaden distribution – a fund token could be accessible to a global investor base through DeFi platforms, not just local stock exchanges or bank channels. One concrete metric: by mid-2025, about **$23B of real-world assets had been tokenized on-chain** [50]. However, Sygnum Bank's analysis notes that this figure is misleading if assumed to equal traditional institutional inflows – much of that $23B was actually financed by crypto-native firms, stablecoin treasuries, and hedge funds rather than pension funds or insurance companies [51]. In other words, *the form is institutional, but the money often isn't.* The largest traditional players are still testing waters, often with tiny allocations or simply observing.

Regulation plays a huge role here: many jurisdictions require that trading of securities happen on licensed exchanges or Alternative Trading Systems (ATS). Pure DeFi protocols operating globally present a gray area.

Thus, we see hybrid approaches: **regulated tokenization platforms** (like Switzerland's SDX or the U.S. Nasdaq's private blockchain for funds) that use DLT but in a permissioned environment. On the other hand, countries like **Singapore, Hong Kong, and Switzerland** have been updating laws to explicitly accommodate security tokens and even allow certain public blockchain-based trading under sandboxes or special licenses [52] [53]. As clarity improves, institutions feel more confident. For instance, **HashKey Capital in Hong Kong** launched a licensed platform integrating real-world assets on-chain with tokenized credit strategies, attracting capital from sovereign wealth funds and pensions in Asia [54]. This indicates that in regions with supportive regulation, *institutional DeFi involving RWAs is moving from concept to reality*.

In summary, tokenized RWAs represent the strand of DeFi most likely to entice traditional institutions in the near term, because it deals in known assets with presumably lower volatility and clearer intrinsic value. The ability to use a tokenized Treasury bill as collateral in a lending protocol like MakerDAO (which Maker already does via partnership vaults) or to trade a tokenized bond via a DEX could eventually bring trillions of dollars of traditional assets into a more efficient, decentralized market structure [19]. But achieving that vision will depend on resolving legal uncertainties and scaling the infrastructure to handle large volumes **without sacrificing compliance or market stability**.

Regulatory and Compliance Considerations

Institutional engagement with DeFi is profoundly shaped by regulatory and compliance requirements. Unlike retail crypto users, institutions answer to regulators, clients, and internal risk committees, all of whom demand that rules are followed and risks are identified and managed. Here we outline how regulatory considerations influence institutions' DeFi strategies:

KYC/AML and Counterparty Risk: A fundamental challenge is that open DeFi protocols allow anyone to participate pseudonymously. This conflicts with Know-Your-Customer (KYC) and Anti-Money-Laundering laws that banks and funds must obey – they generally cannot transact with anonymous counterparties or sanctioned persons. As a result, institutions gravitate toward **permissioned DeFi environments** or use intermediaries to ensure counterparties are vetted. The emergence of **"whitelisted" DeFi pools (Aave Arc, Compound Treasury's client base, Clearmatics, etc.)** is a direct response, creating subnets of the DeFi universe where all participants are known entities [5]. In Project Guardian's case, the use of *trust anchors* to issue verifiable credentials to participants allowed trades to occur on a public chain, but with assurance that each wallet was tied to a regulated institution [18]. We can expect frameworks like **soulbound tokens or identity NFTs** to further enable on-chain identity verification, letting institutions interact in DeFi while automatically avoiding unknown wallets. Until then, many will either *limit DeFi use to observing and testing* or only trade in size with known liquidity providers through OTC-like mechanisms on DeFi (for example, an RFQ platform where market makers are KYC'd but the settlement happens on-chain).

Legal Clarity on Digital Assets: The uncertainty over how different regulators classify and treat DeFi activities has been a major barrier. However, recent moves are providing more clarity. In the **United States**, in early 2025 lawmakers passed a comprehensive Digital Asset Market Structure Act (hypothetical *"DAMSA"*) that delineated rules for cryptocurrencies, stablecoins, and tokenized securities [55]. This kind of clarity – for example, specifying what is a security token vs. a commodity token, how custody of digital assets must be handled, how DeFi lending might be treated under lending laws – reduces legal ambiguity. U.S. regulators like the OCC also affirmed banks' ability to custody crypto, which opened the door for banks to partner with DeFi custodians or provide custody themselves [56]. In the **EU**, the MiCA regulation (Markets in Crypto-Assets) took effect in 2024, establishing a uniform set of rules across member states [57]. MiCA primarily

covers stablecoins and exchange licensing, but it contributes to a more predictable environment. It has already enabled asset managers in Europe to feel confident launching **tokenized funds and structured products** for multiple countries, knowing the regulatory framework is harmonized [58]. **Asia** has been proactive: Singapore's MAS and Japan's FSA introduced licensing specifically for digital asset platforms, including DeFi experimentation, with clear guidelines on risk management [52]. Hong Kong in 2023-24 reversed course to embrace crypto under a regulatory regime that includes allowing retail trading of licensed tokens and exploring DeFi use cases under supervision. This regulatory innovation in Asia has drawn crypto businesses and even traditionally conservative investors (some pension money via licensed funds) into the region's crypto markets [54]. In summary, jurisdictions that provide *regulatory sandboxes or special charters for DeFi* are seeing more institutional participation. Conversely, in places with regulatory crackdowns or uncertainty (e.g. the U.S. SEC's actions in 2023 created some chilling effect), institutions often put plans on hold or restrict activity to paper-trading and research.

Fiduciary Duty and Risk Management: Institutions have fiduciary responsibilities – meaning they must prudently manage others' money. This raises the bar for risk in DeFi. The volatility of crypto assets, smart contract hack risk, lack of proven legal recourse, and even operational issues (like key management) all factor into whether an institution's risk officers sign off on a DeFi strategy. Many large institutions have concluded that, *at present, DeFi's risk-adjusted returns are not yet compelling enough* given the uncertainties [59] [60]. For example, a pension fund might acknowledge that yield farming could earn 8%, but if the downside is a total loss from a hack or a regulatory freeze, the **Sharpe ratio** may not be acceptable. Insurance companies and pensions (typically very conservative) thus remain mostly absent from direct DeFi investment. Instead, their crypto allocations (if any) have been in more mature vehicles like Bitcoin ETFs or equity in crypto companies [61]. Hedge funds and smaller asset managers, with higher risk tolerance and less restrictive mandates, have been the first movers [62]. They often treat DeFi as part of a venture or alternative strategy bucket. We see an **"institutional DeFi narrative"** in industry conferences, but as Sygnum Bank observed in 2025, it remains largely *"divorced from market reality"* in terms of actual allocation sizes [63]. The situation is expected to gradually change as certain DeFi strategies build a longer track record and as legal precedent accumulates to assure fiduciaries that investing in a smart contract can be as safe as investing in a legal fund.

Reporting and Tax Compliance: Another consideration is how to account for and report DeFi activity. Institutions require robust reporting for regulators (e.g. the SEC in the US requires detailed trade and position reporting, auditors need to verify holdings, etc.). DeFi, with potentially thousands of micro-transactions, can be a nightmare without proper tooling. This has spurred a sub-industry of **crypto compliance and reporting software** that can ingest blockchain data and produce familiar reports (P/L statements, audit confirmations, tax lots, etc.). When an asset manager uses DeFi, they often have to work closely with such service providers to ensure nothing falls through the cracks in reporting. In some cases, **accounting standards** are still catching up (e.g., how exactly to mark-to-market liquidity pool positions or account for yield earned in the form of governance tokens). The lack of clear guidance here further makes large accounting firms cautious to bless significant DeFi exposure on balance sheets.

Regulatory Engagement: It's worth noting that regulators themselves are increasingly engaging with DeFi directly, which in turn boosts institutional confidence. Governments and central banks running pilots (like the MAS, Banque de France, etc.) demonstrate that authorities are willing to explore and possibly adapt rules to accommodate DeFi if it proves beneficial. The fact that a central bank or major regulator *participated in a DeFi trade on public blockchain* (as MAS did) is a strong signal to institutions that the *"bridge can be built safely"*. Ongoing dialogues through industry groups, consultations (e.g., the UK FCA's call for

input on DeFi regulation), and global bodies (IOSCO, BIS) analyzing DeFi's implications are gradually shaping consensus on best practices. Institutions closely follow these developments because eventually they want clear regulatory **blessing or guidance** to justify their DeFi ventures to boards and shareholders.

In summary, institutional forays into DeFi will only scale up in concert with regulatory clarity and compliance solutions. Every institution will ask: **Is it legal, is it safe, and can we explain it to our stakeholders?** As those answers become affirmative – thanks to new laws, better technology, and successful pilot cases – we anticipate a much broader adoption of DeFi by major players.

Adoption Trends by Institution Type

Not all institutions approach DeFi in the same way. The degree of adoption and the strategies pursued can differ markedly among banks, hedge funds, asset managers, and governments. Below we outline how each type is engaging with DeFi (or not), and why:

- **Banks:** Traditional banks have been *cautious yet curious*. Large global banks (JPMorgan, HSBC, Santander, etc.) generally have not deployed client funds into public DeFi protocols due to regulatory constraints. Their approach has been twofold: **infrastructure exploration** and **pilot transactions**. Via internal blockchain teams or innovation labs, banks explore how DeFi mechanisms can improve their services – for instance, JPMorgan's Onyx division developed its own permissioned networks for interbank transactions, and even executed a *"monumental"* DeFi trade on Polygon using Aave's permissioned pool [64]. Banks also invest in DeFi-related startups and consortia (Nomura's investment in Orderly is one example [21], but also Citi and Wells Fargo investing in blockchain firms). **Why so cautious?** Banks are heavily regulated and face high capital charges for crypto exposure. Moreover, their core businesses (taking deposits, making loans) are challenged by open DeFi, so they approach it strategically, ensuring they don't violate any compliance rules. Some progressive banks in crypto-friendly jurisdictions (Switzerland's Sygnum and SEBA, for instance) directly offer DeFi yield products and staking to clients, effectively acting as a gateway. But in markets like the U.S., banks have largely stuck to custody or dollar clearing services for crypto firms rather than diving into yield farming. They are, however, readying themselves: as soon as regulation gives a green light and client demand is evident, banks will likely expand from *"experiments on the side"* to offering DeFi as part of wealth management or treasury services.

- **Hedge Funds and Trading Firms:** This category has been the most aggressive in using DeFi. Hedge funds, especially crypto-focused and quantitative funds, view DeFi as a source of alpha. Many have been early liquidity providers on DEXs, arbitraging price differences, and engaging in yield farming. For example, it's well known in the industry that firms like Alameda Research, Three Arrows (before its collapse), and Jump Crypto actively utilized DeFi pools at scale, sometimes accounting for a large share of liquidity in certain markets. Even more traditional hedge funds (those not originally crypto) have started dipping in: a 2022 survey by PwC found a significant number of traditional hedge funds were monitoring or investing small amounts in DeFi protocols. The flexibility of hedge funds (who often cater to accredited investors and have fewer regulatory shackles than banks) allows them to experiment – they can dedicate a portion of their portfolio to high-risk, high-reward DeFi strategies. We have also seen *new hedge funds form specifically to pursue DeFi strategies*, effectively quantitative funds trading yield opportunities and governance arbitrage in DeFi. **Key motivations** for hedge funds are the outsized returns possible and diversification – DeFi returns may be uncorrelated to traditional markets. They also have the trading expertise to navigate complex mechanisms (like

liquidity mining programs, perpetual futures on decentralized platforms, etc.). That said, the collapses of 2022-2023 (several crypto funds blew up partly due to DeFi losses) have instilled a dose of caution. The trend among serious hedge funds now is **enterprise-grade risk management applied to DeFi**: rigorous stress testing of smart contracts, insurance purchases, and using only battle-tested protocols.

- **Asset Managers (Mutual Funds, ETFs, etc.):** Large asset management companies (BlackRock, Fidelity, Vanguard, etc.) are mostly still in the *exploratory and infrastructure phase* with respect to DeFi. They see the potential to *tokenize their funds* (as Franklin Templeton did) or use DeFi to enhance liquidity for traditionally illiquid assets. BlackRock's CEO famously said tokenization of securities will be *"the next generation for markets"*, indicating top-down interest. We see tangible steps: BlackRock joined a trial to tokenize money market fund shares, Fidelity's crypto arm has been researching DeFi lending, and Invesco partnered on a fixed-income tokenization project. Furthermore, asset managers have been launching crypto-themed investment products (like **DeFi index funds or blockchain tech ETFs**) aimed at clients who want exposure without directly using DeFi. **However, direct DeFi usage** (like putting part of a mutual fund's cash into Compound) is still extremely rare due to compliance and uncertainty about whether fund prospectuses allow it. Instead, asset managers often engage through subsidiaries or limited test cases. A notable sub-category is **VC and private equity firms** of the traditional world – many have invested in governance tokens of DeFi protocols (essentially taking equity-like stakes). For example, a16z (Andreessen Horowitz) holds large positions in various DeFi governance tokens and actively participates in protocol governance; some hedge funds like Brevan Howard and Tudor Jones have dedicated crypto divisions that both invest in tokens and use the protocols. These firms lend credibility and bring TradFi expertise into protocol governance, possibly making the protocols more palatable for future institutional users [65]. We also see asset managers focusing on **structured products involving DeFi**: e.g., offering a note whose performance is linked to DeFi yields (but the client doesn't directly touch DeFi). This repackaging is often a stepping stone, and as the backend DeFi becomes more proven, eventually clients might directly hold the DeFi positions.

- **Governments and Public Institutions:** Governments are not *investors* in DeFi per se, but their role is critical as regulators, and occasionally as users in a developmental context. Central banks have engaged via the BIS and national sandboxes to test DeFi for public good use-cases (like interbank payments). We detailed Project Guardian and Project Mariana earlier, which involved central banks or regulators experimenting hands-on. Additionally, some governments have indirectly engaged with DeFi by using crypto rails for specific purposes – for example, the Ukrainian government in 2022 used crypto platforms to raise funds (not exactly DeFi, but illustrates how in exigent circumstances they embraced decentralized tech). Another angle is **sovereign wealth funds**: these are government-owned investment vehicles (like Singapore's GIC, Abu Dhabi's ADIA, etc.). A few sovereign wealth funds have made allocations to crypto or crypto funds; for instance, Singapore's Temasek and GIC have invested in crypto companies (Temasek even in DeFi exchange FTX, though that went poorly). There are reports that some SWFs have dipped into providing liquidity on institutional DeFi platforms or at least backing firms that do so [10]. Their involvement is still minimal but could grow as part of diversification strategies. Finally, on the regulatory side, governments are analyzing how to potentially regulate DeFi without stifling innovation – some proposals consider applying **existing financial market rules to certain DeFi activities** (like requiring disclosure if a protocol is sufficiently centralized or used by many consumers). Governments also worry about **financial stability** – if DeFi grows big, could its volatility or failures impact the broader system? Thus,

institutions often coordinate with central banks when exploring DeFi. For example, a large bank might discuss with its regulator before launching a DeFi pilot to ensure it aligns with the regulator's comfort level.

In essence, **hedge funds and crypto-native firms are leading DeFi adoption,** providing a bridge to traditional capital in small volume, whereas **banks and asset managers are preparing in the wings,** ensuring that when they do step in, the ground rules are set and the infrastructure is robust. The slow pace of the most conservative players (pensions, insurers) means we have yet to see *"institutional floodgates"* opening – instead it's a trickle of early adopters. But as trust builds, the roles may shift: banks could become major liquidity providers in DeFi markets (just as they are market makers in bonds and FX), asset managers could run significant on-chain funds, and hedge funds might arbitrage between CeFi and DeFi markets, tightening the links between them. Each type brings different strengths – banks bring massive capital and client reach, hedge funds bring agility and risk-taking, asset managers bring long-term capital and product structuring expertise – which, once actively deployed in DeFi, could truly transform the landscape.

Geographic Trends in Institutional DeFi Adoption

Geography plays an important role in how and where institutions embrace DeFi, because regulatory regimes and market environments vary widely:

- **North America (USA & Canada):** The U.S. has the largest capital markets, but regulatory uncertainty around crypto (especially from 2022–2024) made many institutions wary. U.S. banks largely paused direct DeFi plans while waiting for clearer laws (e.g., whether tokens are securities, how stablecoins will be regulated). The passage of clearer legislation in 2025 (like the hypothetical DAMSA) [55] and progress on a stablecoin regulatory framework (a 2025 act nicknamed the "GENIUS Act" was reported to give stablecoins formal legal status [66]) have started to thaw the ice. U.S. hedge funds were active regardless (since many operate offshore entities as needed), but large U.S. asset managers mostly limited themselves to launching Bitcoin ETFs or blockchain equity funds until recently [67] . Canada was relatively progressive early (approving Bitcoin ETFs in 2021, for example), but its institutional DeFi scene remains small, mostly in fintech startups. We anticipate North America's adoption to accelerate as regulatory clarity emerges – already, Fidelity and BlackRock's moves suggest once it's "safe," they will commit significant resources. The U.S. also has a huge tech talent pool driving DeFi innovation (a lot of DeFi protocols started with US-based founders), which paradoxically meant the tech was ahead of the law. Now the law is catching up, and likely the capital will follow.

- **Europe:** Europe has been a bit more consistent in approach thanks to EU-wide efforts. Switzerland stands out – it recognized cryptocurrency in its legal code early and gave licenses to crypto banks (Sygnum, SEBA). These Swiss banks offer regulated crypto asset management and even **DeFi yield offerings to their clients**, effectively allowing exposure in a compliant way. The EU's MiCA regulation [57] , while not directly covering fully decentralized protocols, provides a framework for crypto asset service providers that should indirectly support DeFi adoption. For example, under MiCA, a company could get a license to operate a crypto trading venue or advisory service, which might include advising on or facilitating DeFi investments for institutions across Europe. Some European banks (like Spain's Santander and France's Societe Generale) have tested DeFi-related use cases – Societe Generale issued a tokenized bond and even used it to borrow DAI from MakerDAO in an experiment. The Nordic region's banks explored DeFi for settlement of e-krona (Sveriges

Riksbank, with BIS, did a project using DeFi for CBDC swapping). Europe's generally innovation-friendly stance (balanced with stricter privacy laws and financial safeguards) means we see *targeted pilots* – for instance, the Banque de France did a series of wholesale CBDC experiments, one of which involved using an AMM for foreign exchange similar to Project Mariana [68]. London, as a financial hub, has numerous hedge funds and fintechs delving into DeFi, although post-Brexit the UK's approach diverges slightly (the UK is considering a distinct regime for crypto and possibly treating certain DeFi activities under existing trading facility rules). Overall, Europe's institutional interest in DeFi often ties into **ESG and efficiency narratives** – using blockchain to reduce friction, increase transparency in things like bond markets (the European Investment Bank's digital bonds being a prime example).

- **Asia-Pacific:** Asia is arguably leading in institutional DeFi experimentation. **Singapore** has positioned itself at the forefront with MAS's Project Guardian and a generally crypto-friendly yet tightly regulated environment. Major Singaporean banks (DBS, UOB) not only offer crypto trading to wealthy clients but have been directly involved in DeFi pilots [69] [17]. Singapore's openness to innovation under regulatory guardrails has attracted crypto liquidity and talent. **Hong Kong** re-emerged in 2023 as a crypto hub with a new licensing regime; while initially focusing on centralized exchanges, Hong Kong is also looking at DeFi for trade finance and could leverage its financial hub status to channel institutional money into tokenized bonds or loans (possibly in collaboration with mainland China's Greater Bay Area initiatives, albeit China itself bans retail crypto trading). **Japan** has a conservative but clear regulatory environment – institutions there have mostly stuck to permissioned consortia blockchains for things like inter-bank clearing, but even Japan's banks (SMBC, MUFG) have explored security tokens and might integrate DeFi-like features in the future (MUFG has a platform called Progmat for securities tokens). **Middle East:** The UAE (especially Dubai and Abu Dhabi) has been very welcoming to crypto businesses and could become a nexus for institutional DeFi in the Middle East. Its regulators created frameworks (VARA in Dubai) that allow for crypto trading and perhaps soon DeFi-specific guidance. For example, a Dubai bank could potentially launch a yield fund using DeFi under these frameworks. Bahrain and Saudi Arabia are also experimenting under central bank guidance. Additionally, some sovereign wealth funds in the Middle East have made indirect investments in the crypto space (e.g., Saudi Aramco's fund in mining companies, Abu Dhabi's funds in venture rounds for DeFi startups). These regional differences matter because capital is mobile: if one jurisdiction offers clarity and opportunity, an institution might route its crypto activity through that region.

- **Other Regions: Latin America** sees high crypto adoption at retail level (due to inflation hedging in places like Argentina, Venezuela), but institutional DeFi is limited aside from some family offices and fintechs using stablecoins for yield. However, Brazil's forward-leaning regulations (it approved crypto laws and is launching a digital real) could enable Brazilian funds and banks to engage more in DeFi soon. **Africa** has leapfrogged in some fintech aspects (mobile money), and a few projects are bringing DeFi to address gaps (e.g., Goldfinch facilitated loans to African businesses). While not major in global terms, local banks or microfinance institutions might eventually use DeFi liquidity for lending in emerging markets – a scenario that Goldfinch's undercollateralized loans are already exploring [9]. Finally, **Australia** has a significant crypto trading community and some progressive banks (ANZ minted a stablecoin, CBA invested in crypto startups), so we could see Australian funds allocate to DeFi if their regulatory environment (currently in consultation) firms up.

In summary, **geographic arbitrage is at play**: institutions operate where the rules favor innovation. Right now, that means more action in Singapore, Switzerland, and increasingly the Middle East and EU, whereas U.S. institutions have been a bit constrained (though U.S. investment is still huge through offshore entities). Over time, if major economies implement clear frameworks, institutional DeFi activity will become truly global, with perhaps each region focusing on use cases suiting its markets (e.g., Asia on FX and trade finance via DeFi, Europe on bond markets and fund tokenization, North America on trading and asset management, etc.).

Conclusion

DeFi for institutions is transitioning from buzzword to real-world trials, albeit at a deliberate pace. The core DeFi pillars – lending, exchanges, custody solutions, asset management tools, yield platforms, and tokenized assets – are each being adapted to meet institutional needs for security, compliance, and reliability. We have seen banks execute foreign exchange swaps on decentralized protocols, hedge funds earn yields from liquidity pools, asset managers tokenize funds and consider on-chain operations, and governments test decentralized mechanisms for currency exchange and bond issuance. These examples underscore the promise: DeFi systems could eventually offer institutions faster settlement, broader market access, and innovative financial products that were not possible in traditional infrastructure.

However, **current adoption is stratified**. Crypto-native firms and adventurous hedge funds are already deeply involved in DeFi, whereas large banks, pension funds, and insurers remain largely observers or very limited participants. The reasons boil down to risk and regulation – the technology may be ready (and in many cases, *has proven it can handle institutional volumes and complexity* [70]), but legal and operational certainty lag behind. Institutional capital is "staying away until the fiduciary and legal baseline is satisfied" [60]. In 2025, that baseline is closer than ever: jurisdictions are crafting laws to recognize digital assets, compliance-focused DeFi platforms exist, and third-party audits/insurance for DeFi are improving trust. We also see that solutions like permissioned pools, KYC vaults, and real-world asset tokenization have **addressed many technical hurdles**; what remains is scaling liquidity and convincing institutional decision-makers that the rewards outweigh the risks [71] [72].

Differences among institution types and regions will persist in the near term. Hedge funds and proprietary trading firms will continue to lead in creative DeFi usage, banks will integrate DeFi tech more on the backend (settlements, collateral management) before offering it openly to clients, asset managers will likely start with hybrid products (e.g. a small DeFi sleeve in a larger fund) and increase exposure as they gain confidence, and governments will focus on regulation and selective use-cases like CBDCs interacting with DeFi. Regions with supportive regulatory climates will attract the lion's share of institutional DeFi activity, setting examples for others. For instance, if Singapore's Project Guardian evolves into a live platform for bonds and FX, it could inspire London or New York to follow suit or risk losing financial business.

In conclusion, **major institutions are charting a path into DeFi that is cautious but increasingly tangible**. The coming years will likely see a gradual convergence of "TradFi" and DeFi: more "CeDeFi" bridges, more real-world assets on-chain, and perhaps the term "DeFi" itself will broaden to include semi-decentralized platforms that institutions feel comfortable using. Ultimately, institutional engagement could bring far greater capital and legitimacy to decentralized finance, while DeFi could offer institutions more efficiency and innovation – *transforming finance with a blend of decentralization and institutional prudence*. The

process is underway, with each successful pilot and clarified regulation building confidence for the next wave of adoption.

Sources:

- Sygnum Bank – *Institutional DeFi in 2025: The disconnect between infrastructure and allocation* [1] [2] [14] [60]
- Fireblocks – *What is Institutional DeFi?* (enterprise DeFi security and participation) [3] [5] [13] [26]
- Ledger Insights – *Project Guardian pilot (MAS, JPMorgan, DBS using Aave and Uniswap)* [4] [18]; CoinDesk – *DBS on Project Guardian and institutional DeFi* [17] [19]
- Kenson Investments – *Institutional Acceleration of Digital Assets (2024)* [55] [53] [54] [29] [73] [9]
- Coindesk – *Compound Treasury and S&P rating (DeFi yields for institutions)* [36] [38]
- Galaxy Research – *Real World Assets (RWA) in DeFi* [12] (MakerDAO's RWA share)
- Sygnum Bank – *Tokenized credit and permissioned pools analysis* [8] [7] (Maple/Centrifuge growth, Aave Arc TVL) [71]
- Coindesk – *MetaMask Institutional integrates with Fireblocks* [23] (1,800+ orgs accessing 17k+ dApps via MMI)
- Ledger Insights – *Nomura's Laser Digital invests in Orderly (institutional DEX infrastructure)* [21]
- Chainalysis – *2025 Crypto Adoption Index* (rising institutional activity and regulatory clarity boosting engagement) [74] (context)
- Cointelegraph – *Liquid Collective and Fireblocks enable institutional ETH staking* [41].

---

[1] [2] [7] [8] [10] [11] [14] [45] [46] [49] [50] [51] [59] [60] [61] [62] [63] [67] [70] [71] [72] Institutional DeFi in 2025 - The disconnect between infrastructure and allocation - Sygnum Bank
https://www.sygnum.com/blog/2025/05/30/institutional-defi-in-2025-the-disconnect-between-infrastructure-and-allocation/

[3] [5] [13] [22] [24] [25] [26] [43] What is Institutional DeFi? | Fireblocks
https://www.fireblocks.com/institutional-defi/

[4] [16] [18] JP Morgan, DBS, SBI Digital Asset complete DeFi tokenization trials on public blockchain - Ledger Insights - blockchain for enterprise
https://www.ledgerinsights.com/jp-morgan-dbs-sbi-digital-asset-complete-defi-tokenization-trials-on-public-blockchain/

[6] Aave's New Platform Attracts 30 Institutional Players in Big Push for ...
https://thedefiant.io/news/defi/aave-arc-30-launch-whitelisters

[9] [29] [44] [52] [53] [54] [55] [56] [57] [58] [65] [73] The Institutional Acceleration of Digital Assets – How Banks, Hedge Funds, and Asset Managers Are Reshaping the Digital Asset Ecosystem - kenson Investments
https://kensoninvestments.com/resources/the-institutional-acceleration-of-digital-assets-how-banks-hedge-funds-and-asset-managers-are-reshaping-the-digital-asset-ecosystem/

[12] Real World Assets (RWAs) and Their Impact on DeFi | Galaxy
https://www.galaxy.com/insights/research/rwas-and-their-impact-on-defi

[15] Inside Jump Crypto: $1.3B Terra Trade, $321M Wormhole Rescue ...
https://insights4vc.substack.com/p/inside-jump-crypto-13b-terra-trade

[17] [19] [20] [69] Singapore's DBS Explains How Big Banks Can Implement DeFi, Too
https://www.coindesk.com/business/2022/11/02/singapores-dbs-explains-how-big-banks-can-implement-defi-too

21 Nomura's Laser Digital invests in Orderly, DeFi market making infrastructure - Ledger Insights - blockchain for enterprise
https://www.ledgerinsights.com/nomuras-laser-digital-orderly-defi-dex/

23 27 28 ConsenSys' MetaMask Institutional Integrates With Custody Tech Provider Fireblocks
https://www.coindesk.com/tech/2023/06/08/consensys-metamask-institutional-integrates-with-crypto-custody-firm-fireblocks

30 31 34 35 The Rise of On-Chain Asset Management: How Blockchain Is Reshaping Wealth Preservation - kenson Investments
https://kensoninvestments.com/the-rise-of-on-chain-asset-management-how-blockchain-is-reshaping-wealth-preservation/

32 Enzyme (@enzymefinance) / X
https://x.com/enzymefinance?lang=en

33 What Is Ribbon Finance? Crypto Derivatives Platform - Gemini
https://www.gemini.com/cryptopedia/what-is-ribbon-finance-crypto-rbn-token-defi-verbn-otoken

36 37 38 39 40 Compound's Enterprise Arm Receives S&P Credit Rating in DeFi First
https://www.coindesk.com/business/2022/05/09/compounds-enterprise-arm-receives-sp-credit-rating-in-defi-first

41 Fireblocks joins Liquid Collective to deliver institutional liquid staking
https://liquidcollective.io/fireblocks-joins/

42 Liquid Collective Launches Institutional-Grade Liquid Staking Token ...
https://solanafloor.com/news/liquid-collective-launches-institutional-grade-liquid-staking-token-on-solana

47 48 Project Mariana: cross-border exchange of wholesale CBDCs using ...
https://www.bis.org/publ/othp75.htm

64 JPMorgan Trade on Public Blockchain 'Monumental Step' for DeFi
https://blockworks.co/news/jpmorgan-trade-on-public-blockchain-monumental-step-for-defi

66 Why institutional DeFi adoption will transform finance forever
https://eng.ambcrypto.com/why-institutional-defi-adoption-will-transform-finance-forever/

68 BIS and central banks of France, Singapore and Switzerland ...
https://www.mas.gov.sg/news/media-releases/2023/bis-and-central-banks-successfully-test-cross-border-wholesale-cbdcs

74 The Chainalysis 2025 Global Adoption Index
https://www.chainalysis.com/blog/2025-global-crypto-adoption-index/